교육학석사학위논문

Korean EFL Learners' Refusals to Requests and Their Perceptions via Oral Role-plays and Retrospective Verbal Reports

구어 상황극과 구두 보고를 통한 한국인 영어 학습자의 요청에 대한 거절 및 인식

2019년 8월

서울대학교 대학원

외국어교육과 영어전공

박 예 린

Korean EFL Learners' Refusals to Requests and Their Perceptions via Oral Role-plays and Retrospective Verbal Reports

by

Ye Lin Park

A Thesis Submitted to
the Department of Foreign Language Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education

At the
Graduate School of Seoul National University

August 2019

Korean EFL Learners' Refusals to Requests and Their Perceptions via Oral Role-plays and Retrospective Verbal Reports

구어 상황극과 구두 보고를 통한 한국인 영어 학습자의 요청에 대한 거절 및 인식

지도교수 오 선 영

이 논문을 교육학 석사 학위논문으로 제출함

2019년 5월

서울대학교 대학원

외국어교육과 영어전공

박 예 린

박예린의 석사학위논문을 인준함

2019년 6월

위 원 장 이 병 민

부위원장 소 영 순

위 원 오 선 영

Korean EFL Learners' Refusals to Requests and Their Perceptions via Oral Role-plays and Retrospective Verbal Reports

Approved by Thesis Committee:

Byungmin Lee, Committee Chair

Youngsoon So

Sun Young Oh

Abstract

Korean EFL Learners' Refusals to Requests and Their Perceptions via Oral Role-plays and Retrospective Verbal Reports

Ye Lin Park

English Major, Dept. of Foreign Language Education

The Graduate School of Seoul National University

Interlanguage pragmatic (ILP) research area focuses on how language learners perceive and produce various speech acts to explore non-native speakers' pragmatic competence. Refusal has been observed to be a difficult act for the non-native speakers to perform due to its face-threatening characteristic. The current study seeks to investigate how Korean EFL learners refuse the interlocutor's requests in depth. To explore how the learners of different proficiency levels structure their turns in an extended interaction, open role-plays with two native English speakers of different status were conducted with sixteen Korean EFL learners. The collected data were analyzed according to the conversation analysis framework. Further, this study implemented retrospective verbal reports (RVR) after the role-plays and explored the learners' perceptions.

The results revealed that while learners projected elaborations followed by alternatives in all interactions, there were different interactional features in the

interactions with persons of different power relations indicating learners' sensitivity towards status. Additionally, learners of different proficiency levels engaged in the role-plays showing emphatic behaviors in addition to different linguistic capabilities. Moreover, RVRs shed light on whether the learners perceived themselves as pragmatically competent. While most of the students' self-judgments and the native English speakers' comments matched, there were mismatches in which learners' performances were perceived to be inappropriate due to their insufficient or inappropriate pragmalinguistic knowledge. Further, their uncertainties about L2 pragmatic features was present apparent throughout the rest of the RVRs. The findings suggest that it is important to let the students be aware that being preoccupied with the use of accurate linguistic forms does not lead to a successful interaction. The results also imply the necessity of instructions on L2 pragmatic knowledge. Being exposed to the different L2 pragmatics, particularly the L2 pragmalinguistic features, learners would be able to enhance their L2 pragmatic competence.

Keywords: Refusal, speech act, pragmatic competence, interactional competence, pragmatic knowledge, interlanguage pragmatics

Student number: 2017-20124

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Chapter 1. Introduction

The present study employs the conversation analysis frame in examining Korean EFL learners' refusals to requests through oral role-plays with native speakers of English as well as their perceptions on their performances. This chapter presents the purpose of this study in Section 1.1, followed by this study's research questions in Section 1.2.

1.1 The Purpose of the Study

Learning a language does not end with the acquisition of linguistic knowledge but extends to the actual usage of the language. As a component of 'communicative competence' proposed by Hymes (1966), pragmatic competence has also received attention for its importance in being capable of using a language appropriately. Thomas (1983) defines pragmatic competence as "the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context" (p. 92), and Bachman (1990) and Bachman and Palmer (1996) include pragmatic competence in their model of language competence emphasizing pragmatic competence as the prior component in being capable of using a language.

The ability to produce appropriate utterances is important not only for a native speaker of a language but also for a non-native speaker. There is a possibility that language learners may have different perceptions on what consists

of an appropriate linguistic behavior. The field of interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) – "the study of non-native speaker's use and acquisition of L2 pragmatic knowledge" (Kasper & Rose, 1999, p. 81) – aims to investigate non-native speakers' performances in the target language. Learners' pragmatic competence has been examined through their performances of different speech acts, utterances with performative function such as requesting, apologizing, and refusing (Hymes, 1974; Searle, 1969). Culpeper, Mackey, and Taguchi (2018) further explain that the pragmatic competence explored in L2 pragmatics include linguistic knowledge, sociocultural knowledge, and the ability to use these knowledge in an interaction.

Participants' data are elicited from discourse completion task (DCT), oral role-play task, or authentic conversation. Discourse completion task requires the participants to fill in what is left out within a discourse. It has been favored by many researchers because it is efficient (Billmyer & Varghese, 2000); it enables the researcher to control numerous variables and collect a large amount of data and to compare the data across cultures (Culpeper et al., 2018; Edmondson, House, Kasper, & Stemmer, 1984; Kasper, 2000). As an alternative to employing DCTs, researchers also elicit participants' oral data; role-plays have been used frequently as well as authentic conversation. Oral role-plays can be subdivided into closed and open role-plays where closed role-plays elicit a single turn without any further interactions, resembling DCTs and open role-plays allow the participants to freely engage in interactions and produce their utterances. Kasper and Dahl (1991) and

Kasper and Rose (2002) characterize the role-plays as a useful tool that captures details in the interactions such as turn-takings, hesitations, and hedges. A strength that an open role-play has is that by employing an open role-play, the researcher is able to observe the multiple turns in the sequence.

Eliciting data by oral role-plays further enables the researchers to examine learners' interactions using the conversation analysis (CA) framework. Conversation analysis aims to analyze how speakers construct their utterances in the interaction (Culpeper et al., 2018). The use of conversation analysis has been extended to second language acquisition in that the way learners construct their utterances is relevant to their competence (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984; Heritage & Clayman, 2008; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). It provides in-depth analysis on how the learners produce their utterances and how they manage their turns in the interactions.

The present study focuses on the refusals of Korean EFL learners. Refusal is considered to be a "sticking point" in cross-cultural communications especially for nonnative speakers (Beebe, Takahashi, & Uliss-Weltz, 1990, p. 56). There exists a risk of offending the counterpart (i.e., threatening the hearer's face) because by refusing the counterpart, the speaker refuses to comply with the counterpart (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In addition, Brown and Levinson (1987) discuss distance, power, and ranking of imposition as the variables that may influence a person's utterance. Among the variables, power was constantly

regarded as a significant variable in the previous literature introduced below.

Lyuh's (1992, 1994) and Kwon's (2004) cross-cultural refusal studies consider cultural norms such as high- or low-context culture and collectivism or individualism as the reason for the Korean and American speakers' refusals (Hall, 1976; Lyuh, 1992, 1994; Park, 1990; Ting-Toomey, 1988); these differences may have influenced Korean native speakers' tendency to give a relatively less direct, vaguer refusal, to be more hesitant, and to be more apologetic.

In line with these analyses, interlanguage pragmatics studies discuss Korean EFL learners' pragmatic competence via written DCTs (Chung & Min, 2013; Jung & Kim, 2008a, 2008b; Kang, 2013; Kim, 2004; Kim & Kwon, 2010). Examining learners' refusals to persons of different statuses, a primary feature found across the literature is learners' sensitivity towards status. Korean EFL learners' responses were significantly different according to the interlocutor's status. Moreover, another feature of the learners' refusal performances was the presence of negative pragmatic transfer. Kim (2004) and Jung and Kim (2008a) discuss L1 negative pragmatic transfer in the Korean English learners' refusals; their refusals in English resembled those in Korean. The transfers were mostly related to the cultural norms, such as high-context cultural characteristics and collectivistic culture. Further, studies have also investigated the effect of proficiency levels on the refusal performances to seek the relationship between the proficiency level and the degree of transfer (Kim & Kwon, 2010). These studies

elicited learners' refusals by DCT. As Bardovi-Harlig (1999) suggests, the DCT presents information about what types of semantic formulas the learners use and what the learners perceive as appropriate performances. However, Beebe and Cummings (1996) compared the written and spoken productions and found that the written productions "bias the response towards less negotiation, less hedging, less repetition, less elaboration, less variety, and ultimately less talk" (p. 71). A researcher would not be able to find out what strategies or expressions a learner would actually use in an extended interaction by conducting a research using written DCTs (Kasper, 2000). With the attempt to overcome the limitations of DCTs, refusal studies have been conducted using natural conversations (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990, 1993; Taguchi, 2013), closed role-plays (Lee, 2013; Min, 2013), and open role-plays (Gass & Houck, 1999; Kasper, 2000; Ren, 2014; Taguchi, 2013; Widjaja, 1997).

In addition, an increasing number of studies have also shed light on the learners' pragmatic awareness and their pragmatic knowledge (Cohen & Olshtain, 1993; Ren, 2014; Robinson, 1992; Widjaja, 1997; Woodfield, 2010, 2012). The methodology behind analyzing learners' perceptions is retrospective verbal report (RVR) which requires the learners to verbalize and describe their perspectives and thoughts after the task (Ericsson & Simon, 1984). This type of verbal report therefore activates their pragmatic awareness regarding their task performances from their long-term memory (Culpeper et al., 2018; Ericsson & Simon, 1984;

Kormos, 1998). Using RVR as a complementary source for exploring learners' pragmatic performances enables the researchers to note on additional resources other than solely relying on their performances.

To supplement for the insufficient refusal studies on Korean EFL learners, the present study is designed to analyze refusals of Korean university students who have never resided in an English speaking country. The data is elicited via open role-plays with two different native speakers of English, using conversation analysis framework. This study aims to investigate Korean EFL learners' refusals in regard to their different proficiency levels and the different power relations. Furthermore, it sets out to explore their pragmatic perceptions and intentions via RVR. This study examines their intentions behind the learners' choices of the contents and the strategies, whether they were successful in expressing their intentions and whether they perceive their performances as appropriate, and how much they are aware of the L2 pragmatics.

1.2 Research Questions

This study focuses on three particular issues regarding the Korean EFL learners' oral performances. The first purpose is to explore how Korean EFL learners actually perform refusals when they are situated in various situations with persons of different power relations. This will provide information about what kinds of strategies the Korean EFL learners use and the contents in their utterances.

In addition, this study aims to see if there are differences in Korean EFL learners' interactions among their different proficiency levels. Further, the Korean learners' perspectives and intentions behind their actual performance are to be analyzed. Their intentions and perspectives are compared with their productions to look into their pragmatic awareness. The present study intends to investigate the following three research questions.

1. How do the Korean EFL learners actually perform refusals to requests of different power relations?

2. How do the learners of different proficiency levels differ in their performances?

3. To what extent are the Korean EFL learners able to perform refusals as they intended? Are they aware of the pragmatic differences between Korean and English?

Chapter 2. Literature Review

This chapter addresses the theoretical background and introduces previous literature relevant to the present study. Theoretical concepts regarding pragmatics are presented in Section 2.1 – pragmatic competence in Section 2.1.1, speech acts theory in Section 2.1.2, and politeness theory in Section 2.1.3. Then, Section 2.2 provides theoretical background of interlanguage pragmatics. Conversation analysis is introduced in Section 2.3. Finally, Section 2.4 introduces the empirical studies on speech acts: Section 2.4.1 summarizes refusal studies of non-native speakers of English and Section 2.4.2 reviews speech act studies focusing on the learners' cognitive and perceptive aspects.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics, according to Crystal (1985), studies language from the language users' point of view. It includes studying how speakers' engage in conversations. In line with Hymes' (1966) communicative competence, pragmatic competence, as a component of communicative competence, has also received attention. In the following sections, the theoretical backgrounds underpinning pragmatics are presented. In Section 2.1.1 the concepts of pragmatic competence as a part of communicative competence are addressed, Section 2.1.2 describes the speech act theory, and Section 2.1.3 explains the politeness theory.

2.1.1 Pragmatic Competence

Chomsky (1965), by distinguishing linguistic competence from linguistic performance, emphasizes the linguistic competence as the core component that enables speakers to understand and produce language. Emphasizing linguistic competence, competence characterized as knowledge related to language that is innate in each speaker, Chomsky disregards conditions that are non-relevant to the grammatical aspects for the above reasons. As a reaction to Chomsky's linguistic competence and performance, Hymes (1966, 1972) posits communicative competence, which consists of different types of competences more than just linguistic competence. Hymes views competence as the composition of both knowledge and use, thus including both cognitive knowledge and noncognitive factors.

Among the types of communicative competences, pragmatic competence is the focus of the current study. The communicative model suggested by Canale and Swain (1980) is one of the representative and most widely recognized models which consists of grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence. Canale and Swain (1980) identify pragmatic competence as sociolinguistic competence that is needed in order to use language appropriately in context. Further, Bachman (1990) and Bachman and Palmer (1996) categorize language competence into organizational competence and pragmatic competence. While organizational competence consists of

linguistic and discourse knowledge, pragmatic competence consists of illocutionary competence and sociolinguistic competence; illocutionary competence referring to the ability to carry out acts and sociolinguistic competence referring to the ability to use language appropriately according to the context. Pragmatic competence is examined through investigating the speakers' perceptions or performances in specific contexts (Paltridge, 2012), especially through performances of speech acts.

2.1.2 Speech Acts Theory

Speech acts are addressed by Searle (1969) and Hymes (1974). Searle (1969) considers the speech acts as the basic units of communications in that they are performed by utterances and governed by rules. Hymes (1974) as well calls attention to speech acts and refers speech acts to utterances that has performative functions (e.g., requesting, refusing, suggesting, and apologizing).

This study focuses on the refusal act, which Brown and Levinson (1987) characterize as a face-threatening act because there exists a risk of offending the interlocutor. The person who is about to refuse something cannot avoid saying something that the hearer does not want to hear. Thus, refusals require some degree of indirectness and often there is a longer negotiated sequence; performing a speech act appropriately requires the speaker to be polite.

2.1.3 Politeness Theory

Brown and Levinson (1987) elaborate on face with the notion of 'politeness.' Every person wants to claim public self-images, which consist of positive and negative face. Positive face refers to one's want or need to be desirable to others, representing the desires that one wants to be admired or liked as well as be positively related to others. On the other hand, negative face is the want to not be impeded by others, showing how one claims one's territories, wanting to be independent; this term indicates one's need for freedom and desire not to be imposed upon. A face-threatening act (FTA) refers to an act that carries a danger of damaging any participants' face; it runs "contrary to the face wants of the addressee and/or of the speaker" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 65). To minimize the degree of the face-threatening, speakers participating in an interaction tend to be cooperative, using politeness strategies.

Some of the most influential factors discussed in previous literature are the relative power, the social distance, and the absolute ranking of imposition. Brown and Levinson (1987) explain that the relative power is assigned to 'the stable social valuations' so that in each context the power of the participants' roles or individuals are compared (p. 79). The social distance refers to the familiarity or the frequency of the interactions between the participants. Lastly, the rank of the impositions heavily depends on the culture and the context.

Examining speakers' pragmatic competence involves studying how they

perform in specific contexts such as speech acts and how they behave according to the politeness theory. This approach has extended to the interlanguage pragmatics where researchers focused on language learners' pragmatic competences.

2.2 Interlanguage Pragmatics

Pragmatic competence is important not only to native speakers of a language but also to non-native speakers, i.e., language learners. This is the focus of research in the field of interlanguage pragmatics (ILP). This field aims to investigate language learners' acquisition and use of L2 pragmatic knowledge (Kasper & Rose, 1999); research discusses whether the learners have acquired L2 pragmatic knowledge, how they use their L2 pragmatic knowledge in their performances, and what they perceive of L2 pragmatics. Moreover, investigating learners' L2 pragmatics, the focus is on the non-native speakers' strategic use and their acquisition (Culpeper et al., 2018; Kasper & Schmidt, 1996).

While defining pragmatic competence as the ability to use language appropriately in context, Thomas (1983) further emphasizes cross-cultural pragmatic failures that occur when the hearer fails to understand the speaker's intention. Pragmatic competence has been considered as an important yet difficult ability for the foreign language learners; it "reflects badly on him/her as a *person*" (ibid, p. 97); providing resource as cross-cultural communication breakdown.

Despite the continuous emphasis on communicative competence, many language learners still experience pragmatic failures.

Pragmatic errors can be taken as more serious errors than grammatical errors (Won, 2012). When one chooses inappropriate vocabulary or employs ungrammatical forms, these can be regarded as errors due to lack of proficiency. However, pragmatic errors are a different matter; pragmatic errors may act as an obstacle in conveying what one really means because the speaker's intention may be mistakenly interpreted as rude or impolite. Native speakers are less tolerant of the L2 speaker's pragmatic errors and misinterpret them as a sign of arrogance and rudeness (Nelson, Carson, Batal, & Bakary, 2002).

As Leech (1983) and Thomas (1983) discuss, there are pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic failures in pragmatic failures. The former refers to failures that are due to misinterpretation of pragmatic forces; main causes are teaching-induced errors and pragmalinguistic transfer (Fouser, 1995). Language learners may rely on their native language when using the target language. The sociopragmatic failures relate to the beliefs of the target culture; thus the non-native speaker faces difficulties in perceiving what is an appropriate action and what is not. This is discussed as the more problematic for the language learners, hence more difficult to overcome.

Among the various speech acts, refusals are considered to be a major "sticking point" in a cross-cultural conversation (Beebe et al., 1990, p. 56).

Refusals take place in every language, from casual contexts to formal contexts, and it has been known that the way of performing refusals vary across cultures (Gass & Selinker, 2001). Hence, being aware of how the speech acts are performed in the target language is crucial for language learners. Despite the universal politeness strategies and features of face-threatening acts, refusals still vary across cultures (Fouser, 1995). This is what leads to language learners' pragmalinguistic failures. Particularly Korean language has honorifics and requires different attitudes and behaviors according to the interlocutor's age or status (Koo, 1992; Park, 1990); thus, Koreans may perceive English as a language that is not quite polite to an older person or a person of a higher status (Fouser, 1995).

Learners' L2 refusal performances have been elicited via different methodologies such as DCTs, role-plays, and natural conversations. Role-plays enable researchers to observe the interactional natures of the interaction participants while allowing the researchers to control the contexts and variables (Kasper, 2000). Role-play data can be analyzed and discussed within Conversation Analysis (CA) framework.

2.3 Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis (CA) originally examined people's organization of social activities through conversation (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008); thus, it analyzed how people construct and co-construct their interactions in the turns that

they take and relate this to their competences (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). In addition to analyzing sequence organizations and constructions, bodily gestures such as gaze, emotion, face expressions and affiliations have been discussed in relation to turn constructions and sequence organizations (Heath & Luff, 2013; Lindstrom & Sorjonen, 2013; Rossano, 2013; Ruusuvuori, 2013). Despite its original use as a sociological approach, it has also been adapted in second language acquisition in that learners' elicited data are analyzed according to conversation analysis framework in order to investigate learners' competence in sequencing the interactions (Heritage & Clayman, 2008). Gass and Houck (1999) examined the language learners' pragmatic strategies at the discourse level to discover how the negotiations take place in the interactions. Additionally, Félix-Brasdefer (2009) marks the necessity for investigating the speech act performances at the discourse level.

One of the most fundamental features in conversations is adjacency pair, which is composed of two turns by different speakers and are relatively ordered (Schegloff, 2007; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Wong & Waring, 2010). The adjacency pair consists of the first pair part and the second pair part; the turn preceding the second pair part is the first pair part. The two pairs need be of the same pair type; if the first pair part is a greeting, then the second pair part must also be a greeting in return. The projection of the first pair part allows a limited set of relevant second pair parts. Nevertheless, most of the first pairs allow several

types of second pairs.

In many cases, there exists a central second pair part that is a more "preferred" response among the alternative types of responses (Pomerantz, 1984). Schegloff and Sacks (1973) view that the central type of second pair part and the alternative types of second pair part are not in alignment. Certain types of second pair part are more valued or more favored than other types. Pomerantz (1984) introduces the notions of "preference" and "dispreference" to explain the different values certain types of second pair part may carry. A preferred response would be one that is in favor of accomplishing the act of the first pair part. For example, as a response to a request, an acceptance is in favor of the requester in that it aligns with the requester's purpose of accomplishing one's request, thus being the preferred second pair part. While preferred response aligns with the first pair part, dispreferred response does not align with the first pair part; Schegloff (2007) claims that numerous devices such as mitigations, elaborations and variations in positioning the dispreferred response are employed in delivering a dispreferred component. Furthermore, Haddington (2006) and Kendrick and Holler (2017) explain how the gaze patterns serve as useful resources for speakers' stances; there is mutual gaze when the conversers are in agreement whereas there is gaze aversion when they are in disagreement. Thus, like other devices that sequence the dispreferred response, gaze aversion also signals the upcoming dispreferred response.

A request is a dispreferred first pair part (Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2014; Hassall, in press; Liddicoat, 2011; Schegloff, 2007; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006; Wong & Waring, 2010). The act of requesting contains face risk in that the hearer may refuse the speaker's request (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Therefore, the speaker frequently delays the request, beginning with preface markers, announcements, or pre-expanding moves that hints an upcoming request (Wong & Waring, 2010). By initiating one's turn with these devices, the speaker structures the turn so the hearer may pre-empt the speaker's request with an offer, making an offer-acceptance sequence a more preferred sequence (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Hassall, in press).

A refusal is considered as a response by which the speaker "fails to engage in an action proposed by the interlocutor" (Chen, Ye, & Zhang, 1995, p. 121). It is categorized as a dispreferred response in that a refusal does not accomplish the first pair part. Schegloff (2007) characterizes the preferred response as the default; it is generally produced without long silence and it is likely to be short. On the contrary, dispreferred response tends to be lengthier, often with mitigations or elaborations. Furthermore, another characteristic of a dispreferred response is the emergence of pre-sequences or prefaces for they delay the otherwise expected action. By structuring one's turns with these sequences, the speaker may postpone one's refusal. Therefore, refusals require longer sequences of negotiation (Gass & Houck, 1999).

2.4 Empirical Studies

Based on the theoretical background discussed in the previous sections, a myriad of previous research has been conducted in various contexts to examine the speech act performances of non-native speakers of English in the past several decades. First, Section 2.4.1 presents previous literature on refusals of language learners. Studies on the non-native speakers' cognition and perception are reviewed in Section 2.4.2.

2.4.1 Studies on Refusals of Non-native Speakers of English

There has been much discussion about learners' refusal performances. Research has examined learners' refusals in different contexts; refusals of native and nonnative speakers in an American university (Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1990, 1993), refusals of Japanese English learners (Beebe et al., 1990; Gass & Houck, 1999; Robinson, 1992; Taguchi, 2013; Takahashi & Beebe, 1987), refusals of Chinese English learners (Chang, 2009; Chen et al., 1995; Liao & Bresnahan, 1996; Ren, 2014), and refusals of Korean English learners (Chung & Min, 2013; Jung & Kim, 2008a, 2008b; Kim & Kwon, 2010; Kim, 2004; Min, 2013) have analyzed the non-native speakers' pragmatic competence.

Pioneering research on comparing the refusals of the native and nonnative speakers were conducted by Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1990, 1991, 1993).

Advising sessions of native or nonnative students and their advisors were recorded and analyzed in regard to the status congruency of the participants; the nonnative students were found to have different pragmatic competence when compared with the native students. While these studies were conducted with English learners with different L1s, another seminal study conducted by Beebe et al. (1990) examined Japanese EFL learners' refusals. While analyzing Japanese EFL learners' refusals, the researchers suggested a categorization of refusal formulas that have been employed in numerous refusal studies afterwards.

Cross-cultural refusal studies (Kwon, 2004; Lyuh, 1992; 1994) compared native Korean speakers' and native English speakers' refusals. Lyuh (1992, 1994) and Kwon (2004) thoroughly analyzed the semantic formulas and the contents of the refusals of the Korean English learners and the native English speakers via DCTs. Koreans were less direct in refusing while Americans gave more clear reasons. As possible explanations behind the different characteristics between Koreans and Americans, two cultural differences are discussed: a difference between a high-context and a low-context communication and a difference between a collectivistic and an individualistic culture (Hall, 1976; Lyuh, 1992, 1994; Park, 1990; Ting-Toomey, 1988). A high-context culture like Korean culture would depend on the context, encoding very little information in the message while a low-context culture like the American culture would depend on the context with the necessary information embedded in the message. In addition,

a collectivistic culture (e.g. Korean) emphasizes the group over the individuals and prefers harmony over autonomy, but on the contrary an individualistic culture (e.g. American) highlights the individuals over the group and prefers individual interests over group interests.

Subsequently, researchers have continued analyzing Korean EFL learners' refusals by focusing on the effect of L1 transfer (Chung & Min, 2013; Jung & Kim, 2008a; Kim, 2004), social variables (Jung & Kim, 2008b; Kang, 2013), and the effect of proficiency level (Kim & Kwon, 2010). Although there has been the effect of social power in the native English speakers' refusal strategies, social power has been found to play a more powerful role in influencing the Korean EFL learners' refusal strategies and the contents (Kim, 2004). Moreover, the results prove that there is negative L1 pragmatic transfer. Learners' refusals in English resembled those in Korean. Further, Korean EFL learners used vaguer and less clear excuses in their refusals (Kim, 2004) and they used more indirect strategies and less direct strategies which may be explained by the cultural norm that refusing someone with direct expressions is impolite and may sound hostile (Jung & Kim, 2008a). Thus, Korean learners use indirect strategies as well as vague and unspecific contents in refusing others in order to be polite and to not offend the counterpart.

Jung and Kim (2008b) further investigated the effects of social variables in the learners' refusal strategies and note of the different cultural values. Jung and

Kim (2008b) posit that Koreans' acts are based on collectivism and high-context norms while Americans' acts are based on individualism and low-context norms. Thus, Korean learners do not strive to convey everything in their message and as a result much of the message is implicit. Sharing similar findings in general, Kang (2013), focusing on the indirectness of the learners' refusals as well as the effect of familiarity in the learners' refusals, discovered that many Korean EFL learners preferred direct refusal strategies but had difficulties producing a direct refusal. There was a partial mismatch between the learners' intended degree and the actual realization and showed the existence of familiarity influence. Chung and Min's (2013) study also discusses L1 pragmatic transfer such as an acceptance that functions as a refusal. The study conducted by Kim and Kwon (2010) examined the degree of pragmatic transfer in intermediate and advanced learners of English and discovered that the high proficiency learners used more L1 pragmatic strategies than the low proficiency learners.

Most refusal studies were conducted via DCTs due to their feasibility. O'Keefee, Clancy, and Adolphs (2011) claim that DCTs may provide analyses that are unobtainable otherwise. However, the primary issues concerning the authenticity and the unobtainability of interactional features through the DCT elicited data led the researchers to elicit participants' oral refusals (Lee, 2013; Min, 2013). Min (2013) used oral interview questionnaires that resembled oral DCTs in addition to written DCTs to supplement the written data. On the contrary to

several previous literature that discussed Korean EFL learners' indirect refusal strategies (Jung & Kim, 2008a, 2008b; Lyuh, 1992, 1994), Min (2013) discovered that Korean EFL learners employed the modal '*can't*,' a direct refusal strategy. Additionally, they only used a limited range of indirect refusal strategies such as apology and reason. Lee's (2013) study also involved the participants in oral refusals. It examined the situational influence on fluency difficulty of learners' refusals via closed oral role-plays and an RVR. Both power and proficiency turned out to influence the learners' processing speed and appropriateness. It took longer production time and learners had more difficulties when refusing a person of a lower status for the reason of being unfamiliar with the situation, and the lower proficiency group found the tasks more difficult.

Despite further attempts to supplement the drawbacks of written DCTs, the refusal studies that utilized oral performance tasks still relied on learners' single turns. A closed oral role-play or an oral DCT cannot investigate the learners in the interaction; the elicited data does not display the participants' interactional features. Neither Min's (2013) nor Lee's (2013) study allowed the participants to be engaged in an actual interaction with an interlocutor. With reference to Gass and Houck's (1999) statement that refusals take place throughout long sequences of interactions, this type of data elicitation is not sufficient to examine the learners' pragmatic performances.

Especially since a refusal is considered to be a dispreferred second pair

part and a face threatening act, analyzing the written or spoken utterances apart from interacting with another person cannot enable the researcher to detect interactional features in the extended discourse.

In addition to Gass and Houck's (1999) research on refusals of Japanese learners of English, research has sought to investigate learners' pragmatic competence in extended interactions recently. Al-Gahtani and Roever (2018) observed Arabic ESL learners implementing open role-plays. In the extended discourse of refusals to requests, there was an increase of the learners' diverse use of strategies and methods for refusals as their proficiency increased. With the increase in the proficiency level, more methods were at the learners' disposal. Hence, learners' speech act performances need to take place in an extended interaction so that the researcher is provided with the whole context of the dialogue rather than with only fragments of isolated responses.

2.4.2 Studies on Non-native Speakers' Perceptions

Ericsson and Simon (1984) suggest the strength of conducting verbal reports to delve into the L2 learners' cognitive processes. Retrospective verbal report (RVR) is one of the methodology that enables the researchers to investigate learners' awareness and perceptions that are not shown in their performances (Ericsson & Simon, 1984; Kormos, 1998). The intent is to obtain a wider understanding of the reasoning behind the learners' performances; since their

thoughts are unobservable, verbal reports help the researchers access learners' mental processes (Culpeper et al., 2018; Gass & Mackey, 2016). Previous studies have conducted RVRs to complement various types of speech act elicitation tasks (Cohen & Olshtain, 1993; Félix-Brasdefer, 2006, 2008; Ren, 2014; Robinson, 1992; Widjaja, 1997; Woodfield, 2010, 2012). These studies categorized language learners' verbal reports into attended information, utterance planning, alternative strategies, language thoughts, source of difficulties, and pragmatic knowledge. Robinson (1992) implemented both written DCTs and RVR and found that RVRs elicit the processes that the learners undergo. Cohen and Olshtain (1993) focused on learners' cognitive processes and noted that their speech act performances result from extensive thought processes in more than one language. Widjaja (1997), while observing the behaviors and thought processes of Taiwanese English learners, discovered that their use of incorrect refusal strategies may be explained by their lack of L2 pragmatic knowledge.

Further, Woodfield (2010, 2012) examined insights that the RVRs provide in the studies. The former study (Woodfield, 2010) engaged twelve ESL learners in paired verbal reports as well as written DCTs and discovered that RVR provided detailed information on the learners' knowledge and also provided evidence of sociocultural transfer in the learners' processes. The latter study (Woodfield, 2012) also investigated the information that RVR provides concerning learners' perceptions and difficulties by engaging eight learners in open role-plays and

RVRs; the verbal reports provide details on the features learners attended and their linguistic difficulties as well. Learners who attended to the grammar and vocabulary features faced difficulties with the lexico-grammar components while those who attended to the sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic features found difficulties with choosing appropriate forms.

RVR was implemented in a longitudinal study by Ren (2014) in which the cognitive processes of Chinese English learners studying abroad were observed. Data were collected in three phases over one year period and it was reported that the learners found difficulties in their inaccurate sociopragmatic knowledge, inaccurate pragmalinguistic knowledge, inaccurate sociopragmatic knowledge, and lack of pragmalinguistic knowledge. Additionally, they reported less difficulty of the given situations across the phases.

Previous literature analyzed Korean EFL learners' refusals to persons of different statuses employing written DCTs or closed oral role-plays. The data collected by these tasks consist of single responses without any follow-up interactions. Because refusals occur within a discourse, it may be better observed through analyzing the extended discourse, examining what comes before and after refusals. Especially since refusals require long sequences, investigating learners' pragmatic competence through only single responses is not sufficient. Moreover, studying learners' verbal and nonverbal features may provide more in-depth information about how they learners engage in an interaction. Furthermore, studies

on Korean EFL learners' pragmatic perceptions have yet been the focus of their refusals. Learners' perceptions and preferred strategies have been discovered, but there has not been attempt at investigating how they think of refusals, what they consider as appropriate refusals, and how much they are aware of their pragmatic competence.

Chapter 3. Methodology

This chapter describes the methodology of collecting and analyzing the data in the present study. Section 3.1 provides information about the participants. Section 3.2 and Section 3.3 discuss the instruments and the procedures respectively. Finally, Section 3.4 reports the data analysis.

3.1 Participants

This study involved sixteen Korean EFL learners who are attending Seoul National University, their age ranging from twenty one to twenty eight. Previous literature presented the effect of learners' residence in the target language community on their speech act performances (Ahn, 2010; Hassall, 2003; Kasper & Roever, 2005; Kasper & Rose, 1999). Thus, the current study excluded students who study in a major related to English or have any experience of living in an English speaking country.

In order to investigate the different characteristics among different proficiency levels, the participants were divided into two different proficiency levels: the more advanced and the less advanced students. This classification was based on the participants' scores of English certification tests (i.e. Test of English Proficiency developed by Seoul National University (TEPS), Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), or Test of English for International

Communication Speaking and Writing Tests). Since most students attending Seoul National University have taken the TEPS, their TEPS scores are collected and otherwise, other certified English test scores are collected and converted into the TEPS score and level according to the criterion that the TEPS council provides.

Table 3.1 presents the participants' background information – their nicknames, gender, age, and TEPS scores. In the present study the participants are divided into two groups: nine students whose scores range from 701 to 990 belong to the more advanced level, and seven students whose scores range from 401-700 belong to the less advanced level.

Table 3.1

Participants' Background Information

Name	Gender	Age	TEPS Score
June	F	26	901
Chris	F	27	881
John1	M	25	870
Hong	M	28	850
Yujin	F	23	844
Sara	F	25	809
Haley	F	21	800
James	M	24	732
Rissa	F	27	720
Kimmy	F	22	630
Sue	F	22	600
Son	M	25	577

John2	M	25	550
Vlada	F	20	548
Grace	F	20	530
Cindy	F	26	474

All of the participants conversed with two native speakers of English from the United States who were their counterparts in the role-plays. Each native speaker of English played a different role. One native speaker, a middle aged female American currently an instructor at the language education institute, played the part of professor, the person of a higher status. The other native speaker, a female American student in her early twenties, played the part of a friend, the person of an equal status.

Additionally, prior to the current study a survey was conducted in order to choose the role-play situations that carry similar degrees of imposition. A total of eighty two Koreans answered the survey questions.

3.2 Instruments

This section presents the instruments employed in the present study. Section 3.2.1 displays the situations that were selected for the role-plays. Then, Section 3.2.2 elaborates on the questions that were asked during the retrospective verbal reports (RVR).

3.2.1 Open Oral Role-plays of Refusals to Requests

Participants engaged in role-plays of refusals to requests of two different power relations – refusing a person of a higher status and refusing a person of an equal status. Refusing a person of a lower status was excluded in the present study. Refusing a person of a lower status requires the participants to play the role of a boss or a professor (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010; Tanaka & Swade, 1982); however, because learners have never been in this place, these situations are unfamiliar to the learners and thus make it more difficult for them to perform refusals (Lee, 2013).

Unlike DCTs, which may contain numerous situations and still be relatively less overwhelming, oral role-plays are more time-consuming and require more effort. Thus the number of role-play tasks that can be included in one study is relatively limited. In selecting two contexts per each power relation, a survey was conducted to control the degree of the imposition of the request. A total of twelve request contexts, six requests from a person of a higher status and six requests from a person of an equal status, employed in previous studies (Beebe et al., 1990; Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2010; Tanaka & Swade, 1982) were included in the survey to find out the perceived degree of imposition. Eighty two Koreans in their twenties and thirties rated the degree of imposition on a five-point Likert scale, and the average degree of imposition was calculated for each situation. The average degree of imposition ranged from 2 to 4, and the requests selected for the present study contained the

most similar degree, ranging from 3.3 to 3.6.

Figure 3.1 represents the information about a conversation with a person of a higher status that the participants received before starting the role-plays. In both situations, the participants were directed to refuse the interlocutor's requests. To avoid any possible difficulties in understanding, the information was written down in both Korean and English.

1. You are a student, and you go in to your course on the first day of class. The professor asks you to register for the same class by another professor. (The course and the course time schedule are the same with your original course). You are in the position to refuse this.
당신은 학생입니다. 새로운 학기에 첫 수업에 참석한 날, 교수님께서 오셔서 동일한 수업(다른 교수님께서 강의하시는 수업)으로 수강신청을 바꿔달라고 말씀하십니다. 이에 대해서 거절하십시오.

2. You are a student. Your professor comes and asks you to take responsibility for an important event in your department. You are in the position to refuse this.
당신은 학생입니다. 교수님께서 오셔서 당신의 학과에서 개최될 중요한 행사의 책임 진행자가 될 수 있는지 말씀하십니다. 이에 대해서 거절하십시오.

Figure 3.1 Learners' instructions on refusals to a person of a higher status

Then, the participants were given directions about the conversations with a person of equal status as shown in Figure 3.2. In order to prevent any influence of the gender, the first context was adjusted according to the participant's gender; if the participant was a female, the native speaker requested a place for her sister to stay, and if the participant was a male, the native speaker requested a place for

her brother to stay.

1. The two of you are friends. Your friend says that her sister (brother) is visiting her soon, and s/he does not have a place to stay. This friend asks you if you will let her sister/brother stay at your home. You are to refuse this.
두 사람은 친구입니다. 친구의 형제(자매)가 곧 그 친구를 보러 오게 되는데, 그 형제(자매)가 머물 곳이 없다며 당신 집에 머물 수 있는지 요청합니다. 이에 대해서 거절하십시오.

2. You two are friends. She needs money urgently. She asks you if you can borrow her that money (300,000 Won). You are in the position to refuse this.
두 사람은 친구 사이입니다. 친구가 급한 사정이 생겨서 급하게 돈이 필요한 상황입니다. 친구가 당신에게 30 만원을 빌려달라고 요청합니다. 이에 대해서 거절하십시오.

Figure 3.2 Learners' instructions on refusals to a person of an equal status

3.2.2 Retrospective Verbal Report

RVRs have been conducted in various ways; Hassall (2008) conducted RVRs right after each utterance during the interaction, some studies (Cohen & Olshtain, 1993; Félix-Brasdefer, 2006, 2008; Widjaja, 1997; Woodfield, 2012) conducted it after the completion of the task, and the other research (Robinson, 1992; Woodfield, 2010) used them both in between the tasks and after the tasks. Since the four role-play situations all require the participant to refuse the interlocutor's request, conducting RVRs right after each utterance or after each role-play situation would affect their subsequent refusal performances; hence, in the current study it was conducted in Korean only once after the completion of all

four role-plays. The questions that were employed in the RVR all refer to the act of refusal and the participants' perceptions as well as intentions behind their responses. The fixed questions were adapted from previous literature on RVR (Ren, 2014; Robinson, 1992) – i.e., W*hat did you intend to say?, What made you reply in this manner?, What were you focusing on when you responded to this situation?,* and *What did you plan to say?* Moreover, data-driven questions were also used when necessary.

3.3 Procedures

The participants completed a background questionnaire and the consensus form prior to the participation. Then they were given instructions about the role-plays. The participants were given a short amount of time to read and think over the contexts before starting. After roughly a minute or two, when the participant felt ready, s/he engaged in the two oral role-plays. The four role-plays were conducted individually with two different interlocutors for each power relation in different classrooms. The order of the role-plays were identical for all participants; they were first engaged in the role-plays with the professor and continued with the role-plays with the friend. The role-plays were both video- and audio-recorded.

Prior to the role-play, the native English speakers have agreed on the overall frame of the request-refusal sequences and on the extent to which they should elicit refusals from the participants. Additionally, they wrote down brief

comments on the participants' appropriateness and politeness in their refusals.

Afterwards the participants were engaged in the RVR with the researcher. The researcher and the participant listened to parts of the participant's audio-recorded refusals and the participant answered questions regarding their intentions behind their performances as well as their perceptions of L2 pragmatics.

3.4 Data Analysis

This section elaborates on how the current study analyzed the elicited data. Section 3.4.1 presents how the role-play data were to be analyzed, and Section 3.4.2 exhibits how the RVR data were to be analyzed.

3.4.1 Analyzing Role-plays

The audio- and video-recorded data were transcribed and analyzed according to the conversation analysis framework (See Appendix A).

First, learners' turn lengths in general were compared to see whether there are any differences among the group of learners as discussed in previous studies (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986; Gass & Houck, 1999). Then the results of the refusal tasks were analyzed to examine how well the learners succeeded in refusing the interlocutor.

In addition, the native English speakers gave their opinions on the appropriateness of the learners' refusals. They marked their opinions on the

participants' refusals on a scale from very poor to excellent on the following three questions as in Table 3.2: 1) *how did the student's refusals sound? did the responses sound clear as refusals?*; 2) *did the student sound (act) polite while refusing the request?*; 3) *how appropriate was the student's interaction in refusing?*. Then they provided comments on anything noticeable about the student.

Table 3.2

The Native English Speakers' Assessment Scales

	Very poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
How did the student's refusals sound? Did the responses sound clear as refusals?					
Did the student sound/act polite while refusing the request?					
How appropriate was the student's interaction in refusing?					

The analysis for the elicited data is based on refusals as dispreferred second pair parts (Pomerantz, 1984; Schegloff, 2007). A dispreferred component is accompanied by mitigation and elaborations on excuses, reasons, and accounts; moreover, it is often positioned after turn-initial delays, anticipatory accounts, or pro forma agreements. Mitigation refers to the speaker not overtly projecting a dispreferred response, and elaborations consist of excuses, reasons, and hedges. Regarding the positions of the dispreferred markers, they are frequently positioned after inter-turn gaps (i.e., silence), turn-initial delays, or accounts. Moreover, learners' sequencing of insert expansion between the base first pair part (i.e.,

request) and the base second pair part (i.e., refusal) is also taken into analysis. In addition to the dispreference sequence, the classification system made by Beebe et al. (1990), modified by Kwon (2004), is also taken into consideration for the subcategories of the refusal formulas (see Appendix B).

Finally, as already mentioned in Schegloff's (2007) dispreferred sequences, pause fillers such as "uhh" and "umm," silences, and nonverbal gestures such as gaze were also analyzed and discussed. According to Heritage (1984), preference structure is correlated with affiliation while dispreference structure is correlated with disaffiliation. Data were examined to investigate how learners behave to maintain solidarity.

3.4.2 Analyzing Retrospective Verbal Reports

Ericson and Simon (1984) suggest model-based coding which helps categorize the verbal reports into intentions, cognitions, planning, and evaluations. The intentions provide the information on learners' goals and questions that explore the learners' intentions are such as "Why did you say that?" Questions that examine cognitions are such as "What were you thinking when you said that?" providing data about the learners' selection. Planning examines learners' constructions and evaluations investigate how the learners compare their responses with alternatives. Researchers have adapted these categories according to the focus of their studies; attended information, utterance planning, alternative

utterances, knowledge about American refusals, and pragmatic and linguistic difficulties (Robinson, 1992), the assessment and planning of utterances, the language of thought, the processes in the selection of language forms, and attended information (Cohen & Olshtain, 1993), and intentions and pragmatic knowledge (Widjaja, 1997).

The current study focuses on the learners' intentions and their perceptions on refusals as well as L2 pragmatic knowledge. Therefore, the verbalizations concentrate on 1) learners' intentions, 2) the causes of perceived difficulties, 3) their perceptions on refusals, and 4) their L2 pragmatic knowledge and awareness. Examining learners' intentions consists of questions such as *What did you intend to say?* and *Do you think you conveyed your intention successfully?*. Data on learners' self-judgments were compared with the judgments made by two native English speakers. The matches and mismatches between the students' and the native English speakers' judgments were compared and analyzed. The causes of perceived difficulties are subdivided into linguistic difficulties that were relevant to difficulties in not being grammatically correct or not using correct vocabulary and pragmatic difficulties that were relevant to difficulties in performing refusals. Analyses on the learners' perceptions on refusals were based on their thoughts on what consist of an appropriate refusal. Lastly, investigation of learners' L2 pragmatic knowledge and awareness relate to their responses of questions such as *Do you think there are cultural or pragmatic differences between Korean and*

English? and *How much do you think you are aware of the differences?*. Learners' responses were categorized into pragmalinguistic features and sociopragmatic features. Pragmalinguistic components refer to linguistic resources and strategies while sociopragmatic components refer to social perceptions and cultural norms.

A total of sixteen Korean university students and two native English speakers participated in the present study. First, the students were engaged in two oral role-plays with the professor and then in two oral role-plays with the friend. After the role-play tasks, they participated in the RVR with the researcher. All elicited data collected in the tasks are analyzed and discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter 4. Results and Discussion

This chapter displays the findings and discussions of the present study. Sections are subdivided according to the three research questions. Section 4.1 demonstrates the findings of refusing to persons of different statuses. Then, Section 4.2 discusses the findings regarding the learners' different proficiency levels. Finally, Section 4.3 explores findings from the participants' RVRs.

4.1 Refusals to Persons of Different Statuses

This section presents the analysis of Korean EFL learners' refusals to persons of two different statuses in the open role-plays. Section 4.1.1 demonstrates the similarities between learners' refusals to interlocutors with different status. Then, Section 4.1.2 depicts the different features of refusals in the interactions with the professor and the friend.

4.1.1 Similarities

The two features that were frequent in the interactions regardless of the interlocutors' powers were elaborations and stating alternatives. The combination of providing elaborations and then suggesting an alternative was evident in the majority of the participants. Participants organized their interactions so that elaborations of accounts, reasons, and excuses would precede a clear refusal if there is one. Being placed in the earlier turns, these elaborations may either delay

the dispreferred response or substitute for the refusal. Following the elaborations, alternatives were frequently suggested. After providing a reason for the refusal, they repeatedly provided alternatives as a way to make an effort to find a solution to the interlocutor's problem.

Excerpts 4.1 and 4.2 are extracted from the same role-play between Vlada, a less advanced participant, and Pam, the professor, and present how the combination of elaborations and stating alternatives is used.

Excerpt 4.1. (Extracted from Vlada-prof#2)

```
42   Pam     (0.2) .hh [I really trust you? (0.2) ((points=
43   Vlada             [((nods))
44   Pam     =fingers at Vlada)) >and I think< you could do a
45           good job so that's why I >thought of< ((brings LH
46           to the chin)) asking you
47   Vlada   well I'm really happy to [hear this and I'll be=
48   Pam                              [((smiles))
49→  Vlada   =happy to help you professor but unfo:rtunately
50           (0.3) I have TOO: much exams [this week a:nd the=
51   Pam                                  [((nods))
52   Vlada   =NExt week (0.2) .hh and A:lso ((avoids eye
53           contact))I've NEver prepared something like this
54           [event (0.3) in our department so I will be very=
55   Pam     [((nods))
56   Vlada   =[disappointed to (0.8) uh see:n] ((avoids eye=
57   Pam      [((nods))                       ]
58   Vlada   =contact)) some . for bad in your eyes
```

Excerpt 4.2 (Extracted from Vlada-prof#2)

95→ Vlada but (0.4) if you nee:d someone ((puts RH in the
96 air)) who will communicate with [people I think=
97 Pam [((nods))
98 Vlada =you shou:ld ask >about it< ((points RH to the
99 right)) [another person (0.2) uh someone from=
100 Pam [((nods))
101 Vlada =ou::r(0.2) ((averts eyes)) umm labora°tory?°
102 Pam °mm[mm°
103 Vlada [someone from our lab?
104 Pam mmm ((nods)) mm[hmm
105→ Vlada [>I think I< KNO::W (0.2) a
106 wonderful guy who can . do it ((smiles))
107 (0.3)
108 Pam ahhh
109 Vlada >how do you< think about that?

Excerpt 4.1 displays how Vlada explains her excuse. As the interaction continues from previous turn exchanges where the professor has already requested Vlada to take responsibility for the upcoming event, the professor asks Vlada once more in lines 42-46. Vlada expresses an appreciation of the professor's request in line 47 and then elaborates on the reasons why she cannot comply with the professor's request in line 49. She emphasizes that she is busy preparing for exams, and she continues to provide an additional excuse that she has no prior experience of preparing for an event.

This tendency to elaborate on accounts as well as to provide numerous accounts was also observed in learners' interactions with the friend. Learners elaborated on accounts, reasons, and excuses multiple times in each interaction. In

myriads of research, this was a feature that both native English speakers and learners of English have preferred to use the most in their refusals (Beebe et al., 1990; Chang, 2009; Jung & Kim, 2008b; Kwon, 2004; Lyuh, 1992, 1994; Min, 2013). These findings are based on data elicited by tasks that guide the participants to produce a single refusal turn, indicating that even when the learners made a single response consisting of a few sentences, they relied on these strategies. In line with this reliance on the use of excuses, reasons, and accounts, the current study shows that in extended discourses, learners tend to elaborate greatly on explaining why they are refusing.

Excerpt 4.2 shows how Vlada continues with providing an alternative. To project her refusal, Vlada brings up the idea of finding another student from her laboratory instead of her in line 95 and offers to introduce another student who might be able to help the professor in line 105. Many Korean native speakers have been found to prefer the use of stating alternatives when they refused in Korean (Kwon, 2004; Lyuh, 1992; 1994) while as for the Korean EFL learners' refusals in English, Jung and Kim (2008b) found that the Korean EFL learners employ this strategy relatively less than the native English speakers and Min (2013) did not find any of the Korean EFL learners provide an alternative. The present study's different result in using stating alternatives can be explained by the implementation of a different methodology; the prior studies elicited written data. The participants' responses were not elicited from an extended discourse. These

single turn responses contain only few strategies and these responses do not appropriately display how the participants would actually perform the speech act in a discourse. Therefore, the data collected in the current study inevitably contains more diverse types of responses, resulting in the multiple uses of the two strategies in each interaction.

4.1.2 Differences

The different characteristics of learners' refusals according to the two different power relations are further categorized into the following sections. First, Section 4.1.2.1 shows the results of learners' refusals. Then, Section 4.1.2.2 presents learners' sequence organizations in the role-plays. Section 4.1.2.3 and Section 4.1.2.4 elaborate on the verbal and the nonverbal features respectively.

4.1.2.1 The Results of Learners' Refusals

The results of the participants' attempts at refusals varied according to the status of the interlocutor. Refusals to the person of a higher status showed three outcomes while those to the person of an equal status showed four results. In addition to success in refusing, delay of a clear answer, and compliance with the request, refusing a friend also resulted in partial acceptance of the request. The results are presented in Table 4.1 and Table 4.2.

Table 4.1

The Results of Refusing the Professor

	Role-play #1	Role-play #2
Succeeded at refusing	9*	6
Delayed answering	2	6
Failed at refusing	5	4

*The number of participants

In the two role-plays with the professor, the participants used various strategies in order to refuse the interlocutor and the results were threefold: most of the participants succeeded in refusing, a few delayed giving a clear answer, and the others accepted the request in the end. In the first role-play situation, five students ended up complying with the interlocutor's request, two postponed their answer, and nine refused the request. In the second role-play situation, four students complied with the interlocutor's request, six avoided answering, and six refused the request. Needing to make a refusal facing a professor, the participants are likely to have a lower probability of refusing successfully.

Table 4.2

The Results of Refusing the Friend

	Role-play #1	Role-play #2

Succeeded at refusing	11*	9
Delayed answering	5	1
Failed at refusing		1
Partially accepting		5

*The number of participants

The role-plays with the friend had four different results: a full and partial acceptance of the request, a delay, and a refusal. For the first role-play situation, eleven students succeeded at refusing the interlocutor's request and five delayed their answer; no participant complied with the request. The partial acceptance was only shown in the second role-play with the friend, where the participants offered to lend the friend a partial amount of money. In this context, nine students refused the interlocutor's request, five partially accepted the request, one delayed the answer, and one ended up complying with the request. It is notable to see that none in the first context and only one in the second context failed to refuse the interlocutor.

The four requests were selected with the consideration of the degree of imposition; thus, the requests carry relatively similar degree of impositions. However, there was a difference in how the participants performed refusals. In both interactions with the professor, about half of the participants failed to produce a refusal; however, in the two interactions with the friend, only one failed to produce a refusal. One of the reason for the decreased occurrence of refusal can

be explained by the frequency of the partial acceptance, which occurred five times in the second role-play. Even so, students were more successful at refusing the friend's request than the professor's request, implying that the participants perceived the task of refusing the professor more difficult. Thus, it displays learners' status sensitivity; their different results explain how they are sensitive towards persons of different status. Students found it harder to refuse a person of a higher status than to refuse a person of an equal status.

This result shows how open role-plays have different consequences compared to other methodologies such as DCTs. When DCTs are used to elicit participants' speech act performances, they elicit participants' single turn without any follow-up interaction. Unlike these methodologies, open role-plays require the participants to interact with the interlocutor, so the participants need to exchange turns to continue with the conversation. They would need to respond to what the interlocutor says and despite that the situations are imaginary, the participants are engaged in real face-to-face interactions. Thus, the results of the role-plays indicate that involving in an authentic interaction with an interlocutor would result in several different consequences proving how difficult the act of refusal is.

4.1.2.2 Sequence Organizations

Learners showed different projections of insert expansion in their refusals. Unlike in learners' interactions with the friend, in their interactions with the

professor they frequently initiated insert expansions. When the professor projected a request, instead of providing an answer to the request learners frequently formed questions inquiring about additional information. Excerpt 4.3 is a part of an interaction between a less advanced learner, Grace, and the professor in the second role-play situation.

Excerpt 4.3. (Extracted from Grace-prof#2)

26	Pam	and I really . need a STU:d[ent ((gestures with RH))=
27	Grace	[((nods)) °yes°
28	Pam	=to take charge of [the preprarations
29	Grace	[((nods))
30		(0.4)
31→	Grace	°oh (0.4) uh° ((avoids eye contact)) (0.4) when the
32		(2.0) this
33	Pam	the [event ((brings RH forward))
34	Grace	[event yes ((nods))
35	Pam	ahh ((points fingers in the air)) the event is in
36		Janu:ary
37	Grace	°January°
38	Pam	yeah (0.2) ((nods)) LA:TE January
39→	Grace	((nods)) °mmm° (0.2) uh (2.0) uh ((avoids eye
40		contact)) (1.8) [do you talk about this another=
41	Pam	[((dilates eyes))
42	Grace	=(0.8) our (1.0) college students
43	Pam	oh no ((shakes head)) actually (0.4) I thought of
44		((points RH at Grace)) YOU first

Excerpt 4.3 displays how Grace projects insert expansions after hearing Pam's indirect request. After Pam's request, the first insert expansion is initiated

by Grace in line 31, where she asks the date of the event. By the projection of the first pair part of an insert expansion, the focus now shifts to the insert expansion. Therefore, in order to project a turn that is relevant to this first pair part of the insert expansion, the next speaker in turn needs to answer the question. Pam already catches Grace's question before she finishes saying it, shown by the overlap in line 33, and answers in lines 35-36. With Grace's repetition in line 34, Pam once again confirms this in line 38 with an additional detail "late January." This closes the first insert expansion in that the question-answer sequence is completed. Then Grace projects another insert expansion, asking Pam whether she has talked about this event with other students. By this initiation of a second insert expansion, Grace delays her response to the base first pair part, which is Pam's request.

An insert expansion may be associated with the notion of preference and dispreference (Schegloff, 2007). It is placed at where otherwise the base second pair part would come. By initiating the insert expansion, the speaker delays the base second pair part. Therefore, an insert expansion may delay a dispreferred response. Learners regardless of their proficiencies projected insert expansions as a way of delaying a refusal to the professor. They delayed the projection of the refusal more when interacting with the professor than when interacting with the friend. This may imply that learners found refusing the professor more difficult than refusing the friend. While refusing the friend did not require much delay other

than hedges, mitigations, or elaborations of accounts, they did not feel it necessary to inquire about the context or the request itself. However, sensing more difficulties in refusing the professor, learners projected insert expansion in addition to the other devices that they used to the friend.

4.1.2.3 Verbal Features

Learners demonstrated different verbal features in their interactions to the two different statuses. One of the features is the directness of the learners' refusals. Learners frequently refused the friend explicitly using direct refusal strategies.

Excerpts 4.4 and 4.5 display how Son, a less advanced learner, interacts differently with the friend and the professor.

Excerpt 4.4. (Extracted from Son-fr#2)

```
34→  Son    tst . ((glances upward)) ohhh::: but I . I sorry but
35          I have n n enough money so: (0.6) I can't lend °you°
36          the money °to you°
```

Excerpt 4.5 (Extracted from Son-prof#1)

```
117   Pam    so that's why I'm asking you if you . I >really need
118          you to drop °the class°<
119→  Son    ohh ((avoids eye contact)) (1.4) if I if you're okay
120          >can I< can you give me some ti:me to (0.4) think
121          about °it°
```

The two excerpts present different ways of performing refusals. In Excerpt 4.4, Son uses the expression "I can't" to refuse the request directly. Brown and Levinson (1987) posit that to lessen the imposition on the hearer, one of the strategies the speaker may use is to be pessimistic. By being pessimistic, they refer to the use of subjunctives and remote-possibility markers (e.g., could, would, might). Therefore, Son's expression "I can't" is a balder refusal; nevertheless, Son does not utter this explicit refusal without any mitigating devices. Although his turn contains a bald refusal that sounds direct, he uses a prefatory particle "oh" immediately followed by "but I'm sorry" and an account prior to the bald refusal. This may mitigate the effect of using "I can't."

However, when interacting with the professor, there was no sign of a direct refusal. Excerpt 4.5 shows how Son projects refusals to the professor's request. Prior to these turn exchanges, Son initiated insert expansions by asking additional questions regarding the professor's request followed by suggestions of alternatives as well as repeated elaborations. Then, Excerpt 4.5 displays how Son attempted to defer the refusal. Seeking for the professor's consent, Son asks for more time to consider the professor's request in lines 119-121. Throughout the whole interaction, Son never projects a direct refusal.

Brown and Levinson (1987) explain how speakers avoid being direct to lessen the imposition. They suggest one to be conventionally indirect, to hedge, and to minimize the imposition of the act. In a similar context, Schegloff (2007)

discusses that because a dispreferred component is not what the speaker of the first pair part expects or prefers, it is often positioned later in the turn following elaborations on accounts, hedges, prefatory markers, or pauses. Additionally, Beebe et al. (1990) subcategorized formulas into direct and indirect refusal strategies and included "no" and negative willingness ability (e.g., "I can't") in direct refusal strategies.

One characteristic of the direct refusals found common in the current study's data is that these direct refusals took place relatively later in the interaction compared to other strategies or devices. This shows that a direct refusal is the clearest strategy one can use to convey one's intention while due to this same characteristic learners are hesitant to express refusals directly. Despite the fact that this was not a prevailing feature among the learners, it was discovered more frequently in learners' interactions with the friend compared to those with the professor. While the number of role-plays with the professor that contain learners' direct refusal is six, the number of role-plays with the friend that include direct refusals is sixteen. This can be an evidence of learners' sensitivity towards status. It could be because the learners perceived their relationship with the professor more difficult and hierarchical than their relationship with the friend that they were more hesitant to use direct refusals in the interactions with the professor. Although direct refusals are accompanied by numerous mitigating devices, hedges, accounts or elaborations, they are still bald, on-record utterances. Thus, learners may have

disregarded these expressions while they were refusing the professor, in order to minimize the risk of face threatening.

Moreover, data also displays learners' different tendency for the use of expressions of regret. While learners rarely expressed regrets to the professor, they frequently employed this expression to the friend. Excerpt 4.6 is from the second role-play situation between Yujin, a higher level participant, and the friend, Abby.

Excerpt 4.6. (Extracted from Yujin-fr#2)

```
40   Abby   so (0.6) do you >happen to have< ANY money that I
41          could borrow? like ((clasps her hands together))
42          three hundred thousand won? [°can I borrow this°
43   Yujin                              [ahh
44          I REA:lly want to le:nd you but (0.8) hhh ((fidgets
45→         with fingers)) I don't have money too hh[hhhh I'm=
46   Abby                                           [hhh
47→  Yujin  =sorry
48          (0.8)
49   Abby   hhh[hh
50   Yujin      [hhh
51   Abby   is there like . ANY that you could let me bo:rrow
52          or something please ((clasps her hands together)) I
53          >really really< need this
54→  Yujin  but uh ((avoids eye contact)) I'm sorry but (0.5)
55          yesterday I bought (0.3) a flight tick- um a pla:ne
56          [ticket(0.8) um (0.4) .hh so my budget is=
57   Abby   [((nods))
58→  Yujin  =((gestures with hands)) hhhhh awful hhhhh I'm sorry
59          hhhh
```

Yujin states regret three times in her interaction with Abby. Starting in line 44, Yujin expresses a wish that she wants to lend Abby the money. Prefacing a wish can hint an upcoming dispreferred turn. Following the wish, Yujin pauses for 0.8s, while fidgeting with her fingers, and states her excuse for turning down on Abby's request. Her account being direct and clear, Yujin adds an expression of regret afterwards. When Abby makes the request once more, Yujin begins her turn in line 54 with the contrastive conjunction "but," avoiding eye contact with Abby, and apologizes again. After continuing with providing an elaborated account for her refusal, she apologizes the third time in lines 58-59.

Unlike her interactions with the friend, Yujin did not use apologizing strategy with the professor. She focused on convincing the professor that she has reasons for not being able to comply with the request. The participants shared a similar tendency in employing apologetic expressions to the friend while less to the professor; participants apologized in twenty five out of thirty two interactions with the friend while in only ten out of thirty two interactions with the professor.

This difference according to the different power is out of line with findings from the previous literature (Beebe et al, 1990; Jung & Kim, 2008a, 2008b; Kim, 2004; Kwon, 2004; Liao & Bresnahan, 1996; Lyuh, 1994). It has been discussed that expressing apologies was found to be a prevailing strategy for Asian English learners (Beebe et al, 1990; Liao & Bresnahan, 1996), especially Korean English learners (Jung & Kim, 2008a, 2008b; Kim, 2004; Kwon, 2004; Lyuh, 1994).

Researchers have provided plausible explanations relating this to the different culture of Korea such as the collectivistic culture (Jung & Kim, 2008a, 2008b; Lyuh, 1994). Emphasizing the community, placing the group before an individual, the community members try to blend in rather than to stand out. As a consequence, it drives the members to maintain harmony and when they fail to do this, they tend to apologize for harming the harmonious relationship. Not complying with the requester, the Korean EFL speaker felt the need to be apologetic when they refuse in previous studies.

The students' selection of using this strategy to the friend in particular is noteworthy in that it means that they thought that offering an apology together with many explanations and reasons is a better strategy when refusing a friend. One explanation to the different outcome can relate to the perceptions the participants have towards the persons of different statuses. Regardless of the mixed results, combinations of expressions of regrets with other resources such as "but," pre-pausals, hedges, or pauses all signal the speaker's attempt at marking dispreference.

4.1.2.4 Nonverbal Features

Learners displayed different gaze behaviors towards the two interlocutors. While they shifted their gaze from the friend to somewhere else in few interactions, most of the participants displayed gaze shift multiple times during the interaction

with the professor. Excerpt 4.7 is extracted from the second conversation between John, a more proficient learner, and the professor.

Excerpt 4.7. (Extracted from John1-prof#2)

```
70→  John  ((avoids eye contact)) umm::: may be I can (1.4) uh
71         ((leans back)) (0.2) ask (0.2) uh (2.0) uh (1.0)
72         Kevin? ((smiles)) (0.6) [who is (0.2) who might also=
73   Pam                           [((smiles))
74   John  =be: available ((smiles)) . that day
```

While gaze direction has various functions (Kendon, 1967), in dispreference structure gaze aversion frequently occurs (Haddington, 2006; Kendrick & Holler, 2017). Rather than maintaining one's gaze towards the interlocutor, the person projecting a dispreferred response project one's turn with gaze aversion.

John repeatedly shifts his gaze from Pam to somewhere else as he does in line 70. He avoids eye contact with Pam. In this turn John avoids eye contact in turn initial position when he starts his turn with filled pause "umm." John continues speaking, and a relatively long 1.4s silence follows his gaze shift as well as the pause filler. A gaze shift, especially a shift from the interlocutor to somewhere else, may signal a gaze aversion. Therefore, learners avoiding an eye contact with the professor in the present study's data hints an upcoming dispreferred response or an elaborated excuse that delays the dispreferred response.

They employed this strategy to minimize the threats to the professor's face. This shows learners' sensitivity towards the professor; more gaze aversion to the professor displays learners' struggles with refusing a person of a higher status.

4.2 Refusals of Students of Different Proficiencies

In this section, the students' refusals are analyzed according to their different proficiency levels. Section 4.2.1 depicts how learners of two different proficiencies displayed their linguistic abilities. Further, Section 4.2.2 presents learners' (in)ability to express empathy to the interlocutor.

4.2.1 Displaying Learners' Linguistic Abilities

While participants produced utterances in various lengths, their turn lengths in general varied according to their proficiency levels. Excerpt 4.8 is extracted from Grace, a less advanced student, and Excerpt 4.9 is extracted from Chris, a more advanced student.

Excerpt 4.8. (Extracted from Grace-prof #1)

```
52  Pam    oh [((nods))
53→ Grace     [uh (1.0) but (0.4) I ((clasps her hands
54         together)) really want to (0.4) to listen your your
55         class (0.4) and (0.2) uh I don't know well . about .
56         ((gestures with both hands in the air))other (0.8)
57         another (0.4) the other? hhhh
```

Excerpt 4.9. (Extracted from Chris-prof #1)

```
20→ Chris  uhhhh: (0.8) I I ((claps, clasps her hands together))
21         REA::LLY wish I could [help you but=
22  Pam                          [((smiles))
23  Chris  =((avoids eye contact)) (0.2) ummm (0.6) as I::m
24         ((looks up)) (0.8) expecting . a ((fidget with
25         fingers)) graduA:tion next semester [and I=
26  Pam                                        [((nods))
27  Chris  =((gestures with hands)) REA:::LLY need to take this
28         class for my graduation [and actually ((avoids eye=
29  Pam                            [((nods))
30  Chris  =contact)) (0.2) I already got this (1.0) uh
31         uh ((gestures with RH)) (1.4) permiss[ion? ((tilts=
32  Pam                                         [((nods))
33  Chris  =head to the left)) for from the firm? a:nd ((avoids
34         eye contact)) (0.4) so: my [((avoids eye contact))=
35  Pam                               [((nods))
36  Chris  =graduation HA::S to BE: (0.2) uh ((avoids eye
37         contact, gestures with hands)) (0.2) implemented
38         (0.2) without any [((clasps her hands together))=
39  Pam                      [((nods, smiles))
40  Chris  =dela:y or (0.2) excetra =so .hh (0.2) uhh:
41         ((smiles)) I'm really sorry to tell you that
42         [(0.2) ((gestures with both hands)) I really=
43  Pam    [((nods))
44  Chris  =cannot . change the class
```

The lengths of Grace's and Chris' productions varied greatly. In Excerpt 4.8, Grace's turn continues from line 53 to line 57. Her utterances are relatively short and simple. In this single turn, Grace starts with an opening "uh" followed

by 1.0s silence, then with the contrastive conjunction “but,” another silence, and nonverbal gestures, she states her account for why she is trying to decline the professor’s request.

In Excerpt 4.9, when Chris takes her turn employing one of the refusal strategies, her turn continues from line 20 to line 44 with Pam’s nonverbal gestures overlapping in between. Similar to Grace, Chris also begins her turn with a pre-pausal “uhh” combined with a 0.8s pause. Then she expresses a wish that hints an upcoming dispreferred part; this hint is confirmed by the conjunction “but” followed by nonverbal gestures that indicate avoidance and accounts for her refusal. Compared to Grace, Chris elaborates on her excuse in a lengthy turn, accompanied by various gestures. This difference in the turn length shows learners’ different linguistic ability.

Chris shows her ability to convey her message with relatively well-controlled language use. Her capability of emphasizing certain expressions by stressing or lengthening some syllables; in line 21, to emphasize that she wishes to help the professor, the word “really” was lengthened and stressed. Similar tendencies could be seen in other participants. In other words, the more the participants are advanced, the lengthier their turns become. This may be explained by the students’ higher ability of expressing what one wants to express. With a better control of their language, the more advanced level students are capable of producing utterances that they wish to produce with comparative ease.

In addition, learners' proficiency level differently affected their capability of producing words as well as utterances. First, this was found in the less proficient learners' explicit expressions that imply their linguistic difficulties. Excerpts 4.10 and 4.11 are from interactions between a less proficient learner and the professor.

Excerpt 4.10. (Extracted from John2-prof#2)

108	Pam	((leans forward)) umm (1.0) ((nods)) um ↑don't you
109		think you'll have some down time? ((leans backward))
110→		(0.4)
111→	John	down time?
112	Pam	↑yeah ((tilts her head)) sometime when you're with
113		your friends like ↑SIX WEEKS is like REA:[::LLY=
114	John	[mm
115	Pam	=lo:ng time n your FRIENDS might >want a little<
116		↑BREA:K I don't ((shakes head)) think they would
117		mi:nd if you did a few ((jiggles her fingers)) emails
118		li:ke (0.4) they might even ((nods)) help you

In Excerpt 4.10, a combination of 0.4s silence in line 110 and John's repair initiation in line 111 showing that John had trouble with understanding Pam's previous turn. When a hearer encounters a trouble, whether that be a misunderstanding or a mishearing, one projects insert expansion with a repair. Accompanying a sense of urgency, repair becomes the focus as it interrupts the base sequence (Schegloff, 2007; Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977; ten Have, 2007). After this trouble is solved is when the two conversers go back to their base

sequence. If there was no mishearing or misunderstanding of Pam's question in lines 108-109, John's answer would be likely to come next. However, a short pause precedes John's turn, and after this pause he initiates a repair by repeating the trouble source "down time." Because of his repair initiation, it can be said that the reason for the previous pause is due to John not understanding Pam's question. Therefore, with the repair sequence brought up to the focus of the interaction, Pam repairs the word "down time" by providing an example. This interaction displays how a less advanced learner finds a way to settle a linguistic difficulty.

Excerpt 4.11. (Extracted from Son-prof#2)

94	Pam	[if you can do it
95	Son	[((nods))
96		(0.4)
97→	Son	.hhh what kind of (1.0) uh (0.8) ((glances upwards))
98		not sure what °is what I have to say°
99	Pam	((tilts her head)) event?
100		(0.6)
101	Son	what kind of working?
102	Pam	oh >what kind of work< [oh you need to=
103	Son	[yeah
104	Pam	=O:RG[ANI:ZE i:t yeah so .hhh you don't have to do=
105	Son	[organizing
106	Pam	=it all yourself

Excerpt 4.11 presents another less advanced learner trying to search for the word that he intended to say. In line 94 Pam formulates her request as "if you can

do it." The silence after Pam's insistence can be interpreted in two ways; it could have been a way of mitigating, to delay his refusal or it could also have been due to his linguistic difficulty. After the silence Son explicitly expresses the trouble he is currently having in lines 97-98; he overtly says that he is searching for words. Further, these instances were mentioned in Son's verbal report. He admitted that at times he faced linguistic difficulties with finding certain words and this made him hesitate and stumble on his words. These indicate that Son's silence in line 96 would be more relevant to a linguistic problem he encountered. In this instance, Son expresses the source of trouble; so Pam steps in to help Son.

Learners of higher proficiency rarely initiated repair in the interactions with both interlocutors; in the few interactions where they projected repair initiation, it was to confirm their understanding of the native English speakers' previous turn rather than misunderstanding and this was mostly to stress that they are unavailable on the conditions that the interlocutor suggests. Therefore, the function of employing repair sequence differs from that of the less advanced learners' repair sequence in that the more proficient learners chose to project repair sequences to make their refusals persuasive.

Less proficient learners' more frequent intra-turn pauses were displayed throughout their interactions. Excerpt 4.12 is from a more advanced learner's turn and Excerpt 4.13 is from a less advanced learner's turn.

Excerpt 4.12. (Extracted from Haley-prof#2)

```
23   Pam    I thought of you ((point out with a finger)) Haley
24          (0.4)
25→  Haley  .hh ((avoids eye contact)) o::kay: firstly:: I: (0.2)
26          I persona:lly:: really appreciate your o:ffer:::
27          [>you know< to:: think of ((gestures with hands))=
28   Pam    [((nods))
29   Haley  =me: as fi:rst person [to be part of the eve::nt]=
30   Pam                          [((nods))                 ]
31→  Haley  =but (0.4) >you know< (0.2) I:: this is my last yea:r
32          and I'm really busy [right now? I'm working on some=
33   Pam                        [((nods))
34   Haley  =PApers °and projects and° all the graduA:tion
```

Excerpt 4.13. (Extracted from John2-prof#2)

```
65   Pam   oh where are you going
66         (0.4)
67→  John  .hhh uh ((touches his chin)) I'm going to:: ((glances
68         upwards)) (3.2) trave:l (2.0) yeah ((nods)) (0.2)
69         travel with my: (0.8) ((puts RH in the air)) VERY best
70         friends and this is (1.0) the (0.8) first chance with
71         my friends so
```

The two excerpts display differences in the pauses. Haley in Excerpt 4.12 pauses shorter and less than John in Excerpt 4.13. Haley is more capable of projecting her turns without much pauses than John. Further, considering the positions of Haley's and John's pauses, John's pauses are likely to disrupt the continuity of his utterance.

According to Riggenbach (1991), pauses that occur in predictable

positions – such as at clausal boundaries (Hawkins, 1971) – sound fluent but pauses that occur in positions other than the clausal or phrasal boundaries signal disfluency in that they interrupt the smooth flow of the speech. Furthermore, low proficient students were found to be hesitant because of their problems of retrieving grammatical or lexical information (Kormos & Denes, 2004); the durations of their pauses increase when the learners experience cognitive load (Cappella, 1979; Heldner & Edlund, 2010).

In Haley's turns in Excerpt 4.12, there are pauses in lines 25 and 31. A 0.2s pause in line 25 takes place after she utters "I" but she quickly reinitiates her words. The short duration as well as the position enables her to continue her turn without any disruption. Similarly, her pauses in line 31 do not interrupt the flow of her turn. She first pauses after the conjunction "but" and then pauses again after the clause "you know." These pauses do not occur in between non-clausal boundaries. Moreover, these pauses may be the result of either a sign of hesitance or of Haley searching for the next word. Searching for the precise term resulted in the intra-turn pauses in Haley's utterances, and by pausing she attempted to delay her productions. Silence is a type of self-initiated repair orientation in that the speaker may postpone one's upcoming production (Kitzinger, 2013).

On the other hand, the pauses in Excerpt 4.13 have different features. In prior to this excerpt, Pam explained to John about the event and projected a request and John mentioned his unavailability during the time of the event. The inter-turn

gap in line 66 is caused by John's delay in his answer. While the overall sequence of this interaction is a request-refusal sequence, the inserted first pair in line 65 indicates that this is a question-answer sequence. Thus, this gap would have been more likely to result from John planning what to say next. In John's turn starting in line 67, there are several intra-turn pauses and these pauses are quite lengthy, ranging from 0.8s to 3.2s. Moreover, these intra-turn gaps occurred between words. The pauses in John's turn occur at both clausal boundaries and between words. The pauses, almost adjacent to one another, disrupts the flow of his turn; thus, these recurrent pauses display John's proficiency level. The intra-turn pauses occurring at other than clausal, phrasal boundaries indicate that John was searching for the right words. The pauses signal that he needed more time to think about his utterance. Further, John shows a similar tendency with Haley in self-initiated repair orientation. His pauses that occurred at other than clausal boundaries indicate his attempts at searching for precise terms. By employing lengthy silences, he tried to postpone the following productions. Nonverbal features such as glancing upwards in lines 67-68 and hand gestures in line 69 imply that his turn is not finished. In consequence, the native speaker does not provide any repairs but wait until John finishes his turn.

Intra-turn pauses positioned at other than clausal boundaries have been discovered mostly in the less advanced learners' interactions. Moreover, the duration of the pauses was also longer in the less advanced learners' interactions.

As seen above, in several of the less advanced learners' interactions, the duration of lengthier pauses were longer than 1.5s. These display learners' different capability of planning in advance and of performing their linguistic abilities.

4.2.2 The Ability to Express Empathy

Further, data presents a difference that is relevant to both the interlocutor's status and the learner's proficiency level; in the more proficient learners' interactions with the friend were emphatic expressions. The participants rarely expressed empathy towards the professor while the more advanced learners frequently uttered emphatic expressions to the friend. The less advanced learners' interactions with the friend did not show much difference from those with the professor in regard to their affectivity whereas the more advanced learners were very affiliative to the interlocutor and expressed empathy throughout the interactions. These emphatic responses are reactions to the interlocutor's announcements, affiliating with the interlocutor. A request is frequently preceded by announcements that the requester project before one makes the request. These announcements can provide information on the requester's upcoming request.

Excerpt 4.14 is between Haley, a more proficient learner, and Abby in the first role-play situation.

Excerpt 4.14. (Extracted from Haley-fr#1)

```
17   Abby    yeah it turns out that the hote:l ((smiles)) that
18           she's staying: in? (0.2) o like kicked her ou:t they
19           won't ((HSs)) let her stay [there anymore
20→  Haley                              [oh ((avoiding eye
21           contact))] that's too bad
22   Abby    yeah something about . the hotel being full
```

Excerpt 4.14 displays the first role-play interaction between Haley and Abby. This took place right after the two conversers exchange greetings. Abby projects an announcement on how her sister does not have a place to stay; later in the interaction this leads to the base first pair part, the request, so Abby's current turn can be interpreted as an announcement that precedes the request. Overlapping with the latter part of Abby's utterance, in line 20 Haley empathizes with Abby by saying "that's too bad." She conveys the message that she understands the difficult situation that Abby is situated in. By being responsive, Haley tries to maintain the solidarity between them.

Excerpt 4.15 is an interaction between June, a more advanced learner, and Abby in the second role-play situation and shows another way of affiliating with the interlocutor.

Excerpt 4.15. (Extracted from June-fr#2)

```
19    Abby   he said that we need this BRAnd new textbook for
20           the [end . of the        [class
21→   June        [((dilates pupils)) [oh my god
22    Abby   like this big final project
```

23	June	is he the author?
24	Abby	it-h ((HSs)) I . ((moves the body back and forth))
25		he better be he [better give those for free
26	June	[hahaha ((leans back)) hahaha
28	Abby	because ((leans forward)) it's a THREE hundred
29		thousand won textbook
30→	June	(0.6) ((dilates pupils, gasps)) three . is .
31		((gestures with hands)) su- is there [such=
32	Abby	[hahahaha
33→	June	=a (0.5) hhhh I didn't know such ((puts hands
34		forward and gestures)) . textbook eXIsts but (0.4)
35	Abby	°it's so expensive°
36	June	(0.2) [but its WOR-
37	Abby	[it's like ((gestures with RH)) this big it's
38		like . ((HSs)) like three thousand pages it's insane
39		but yeah we need it [for our big final project=
40→	June	[°oh my god°
41	Abby	=((HSs)) and I don't have the money for it I dunno
42		what I'm gonna do . I guess I'[ll just like
43→	June	[it's like the
44		(1.0) the ((avoids eye contact)) (0.2)
45		worst (0.2) professor and hahaha
46		[((gestures with hands)) in the history=
47	Abby	[((moves up and down)) he's the worst hahaha
48→	June	=hahahahaha oh my god hahahahaha
49	Abby	no I hate him SO much and >so does everyone else in
50		the [class.<
51→	June	[oh my god.

June uses nonverbal gestures as well as expressions to express her empathy to Abby. Two different ways June expresses her shock at what Abby said are the use of "oh my god" in lines 21, 40, 48, and 51 and the gesture of dilating her pupils

in lines 21 and 30. Another way June empathizes with Abby is by projecting an assessment of the professor. After Abby announces her situation in lines 19-20, June makes an overlapping turn with the expression “oh my god” while dilating her pupils. The combination of “oh my god” with the dilation of her pupils indicates her surprise at hearing Abby’s announcement. Therefore, June shows her shock at Abby’s saying that her professor required that the students prepare a new textbook near the end of the semester. The expression “oh my god” is also uttered in lines 40, 48, and 51, showing June’s surprise at Abby’s situation; particularly, she chooses to project this turn in different voice tones by nearly whispering this in line 40. Additionally, the dilation of pupils also signal June’s shock in lines 21 and 30.

Further, June provides her opinions that coincide with Abby’s in lines 30-34 and 43-48. Following lines 28-29 where Abby reveals the information that the textbook that she needs to prepare is three hundred thousand won, June dilates her pupils as well as stutters pieces of words with short pauses as if she cannot believe what she heard. Her comment “I didn’t know such textbook exists” aligns with Abby’s assessment “it’s so expensive” in the next line. June projects a strong agreement with Abby’s comment; this is one way to be affiliative (Lindstrom & Sorjonen, 2013; Pomerantz, 1984). Then after hearing Abby say “I don’t know what I’m going to do” in lines 41-42, June provides an assessment on the professor as if she is speaking for Abby. June describes the professor as “the worst professor

in the history" in lines 43-46. It is shown that this assessment coincides with Abby's feelings in Abby's subsequent turn. Abby agrees with June and says "I hate him SO much and so does everyone else in the class." June's assessment, which is in line with Abby's, can be considered as an affiliative response in that she intensifies the assessment towards the professor using "the worst." This supports her attempt at projecting an affiliative action.

The participants' responsive attitudes to the friend coincides with their answers from the RVRs. When the participants talked about refusing someone in general, rather than someone of a higher status, most of them agreed on the importance of emphasizing with the interlocutor, showing the interlocutor that they understand the interlocutor's difficult situation. Furthermore, an explanation for the difference between the two different proficiency levels could be that either the less proficient level learners do not have enough knowledge on the different strategies that they can employ or they cannot yet employ these in an authentic interaction because they are not yet in full control of their language. The less proficient students did not show any use of the strategies mentioned above; they focused more on expressing what they wish to say in English than to think about the numerous strategies that can make their interaction richer and more natural.

4.3 Retrospective Verbal Reports

This section reports the findings from the learners' retrospective verbal

reports after the open role-plays. The learners' responses are categorized into 1) their intentions behind the linguistic and the strategic selections and the native English speakers' perceptions in Section 4.3.1, 2) the perceived difficulties and the causes of the difficulty in Section 4.3.2, 3) their perceptions on refusals in Section 4.3.3, and 4) their pragmatic knowledge and awareness in Section 4.3.4.

4.3.1 The Intentions

The learners were asked of their intentions behind their refusals: the reasons they used specific excuses/explanations, the messages that they intended to convey, and their perceptions of how well their messages were conveyed. Further, the two native English speakers' feedback on the participants' refusals were also referred to during the analysis.

Regardless of the students' perceptions on whether their intention was carried out, the most commonly reported intentions behind the students' refusals were 1) to state sound reasons to which the interlocutors would not refute in order to not hurt the interlocutor's feelings and 2) to use strategies such as questionings or hedging to earn more time and delay the refusals.

The following excerpts show what the participants thought before or while they were interacting with the native English speakers. Excerpt 4.16 is from Sue, a less proficient learner.

> Excerpt 4.16. Sue: I focused on conveying the message that 'my saying no is not because I do not like you (the professor) or I do not want to do it but because of other external factors.'

Sue mentions the strategy of providing numerous excuses to the interlocutors and these reasons tend to be related to external factors than personal or emotional reasons. Like Sue, students considered that attributing their refusals to some external factors would be appropriate. This is shown in her response that she tried to convey the message that her reason for refusing the professor is not because of personal reasons but because of other, more suitable reasons. One of the reasons she used in the interaction with the professor was that she will not be able to help the professor with managing the event because she will have a job by then. By referring to an external factor that prevents her from participating in the event, Sue stressed that her refusal is not based on her personal feelings. Moreover, just as she intended, the interlocutor considered Sue's refusals to be clear, yet polite. The interlocutor regarded Sue's excuses to be valid and sound and providing these excuses did not make Sue sound impolite.

This tendency was evident in many students' responses in that they thought providing a personal reason would be neither polite nor appropriate; thus, to avoid hurting the interlocutor's feelings, they tried to state excuses that are due to external factors, factors that they cannot control. Their intentions of providing valid excuses were well conveyed to the native English speakers. The native

speakers, while commenting on the learners' utterances, consider valid, reasonable excuses as polite and persuasive rather than refusing directly.

Excerpt 4.17 shows Son, a less advanced learner, explaining how he used questioning strategy while refusing the professor.

> Excerpt 4.17. Son: I kept asking the professor about the details of the events. When it is, what I need to do, and why it needs to be me.

In Son's report, it is shown that he used questioning strategy to delay his answer. This is a way to delay giving a dispreferred response. As Son mentions, this was a strategy that students frequently used in their refusals to the professor. The use of questioning strategy occurred in the learners' projection of insert expansions. It can be seen as a strategic action since by asking questions in between the request and the refusal the speaker can earn more time before they actually perform a refusal; by using this strategy the speaker can delay their refusal. In line with Son's intentions, the professor also commented that this was polite. She understood this as an effort to know more about the situation before clearly refusing.

Learners' self-judgments on the delivery of their intentions and the native English speakers' assessments were analyzed; the results are categorized as a match or a mismatch between self-judgments and the interlocutors' comments. Counting the role-plays with each interlocutor as one set, there were a total of

thirty two sets. For the interactions with both the professor and the friend, there were eleven matches each. Among these matches, there were two instances, one per the interactions with each interlocutor, where the student provided a negative judgment but the interlocutor evaluated the performance positively. The remaining twenty matches indicate that both the students and the interlocutors judged the interactions to be appropriate.

The majority of the interactions were regarded successful by the students and the native English speakers. The students expressed certainty in successfully delivering their intentions to the interlocutors. Excerpt 4.18 displays an example of this match with the verbal reports of Haley, a more proficient learner and Excerpt 4.19 shows a part of her interaction with the professor.

Excerpt 4.18. Haley: I tried to persuade the interlocutor that because of the external factors I can't say yes. I felt that this worked well and I think they understood my intention clearly.

Excerpt 4.19 (Extracted from Haley-prof#2)

23	Pam	I thought of you ((point out with a finger)) Haley
24		(0.4)
25→	Haley	.hh ((avoids eye contact)) o::kay: firstly:: I: (0.2)
26		I persona:lly:: really appreciate your o:ffer:::
27		[>you know< to:: think of ((hand gestures)) me: as=
28	Pam	[((nods))
29	Haley	=fi:rst person [to be part of the eve::nt] but=
30	Pam	[((nods))]

31→ Haley =(0.4) >you know< (0.2) I:: this is my last yea:r
32 and I'm really busy [right now? I'm working on some=
33 Pam [((nods))
34→ Haley =PApers °and projects and° all the graduA:tion
35 process? so I don't think °↑I can really make
36 it::::::°

Haley was one of the students who reported to have L2 pragmatic knowledge and to interact with native English speakers thinking about these pragmatic aspects. In Excerpt 4.19, from line 25, Haley expresses appreciation; she thanks the professor for thinking about her as the appropriate person for the event. Then her choice of stating a valid reason made her refusal sound appropriate. Furthermore, the native English speaker notes on Haley's expression "I don't think I can really make it" in lines 35-36; this made Haley sound more polite and less straightforward. As seen in her verbal report in Excerpt 4.18, she constantly tried to explain why she would be unable to comply with the professor's request. Her attempt at providing a valid reason in Excerpt 4.19 aligns with her response.

Similar to Haley, learners whose self-judgments positively matched the interlocutor's assessments indicate that they are capable of conveying their messages and making their intentions sound appropriate and polite.

Of the ten mismatches between the students' and the interlocutors' judgments, five belonged to instances where despite learners' uncertainty of conveying their intentions, the native English speaker took the speaker's intentions well. The rest, five mismatches, showed that opposed to the student's positive

judgment, the native English speaker judged otherwise.

The first type of mismatch was between the students' uncertainties and the interlocutor's positive assessments on their performances. Excerpt 4.20 shows a less advanced learner Sue attributing the cause of her uncertainty to her lack of pragmatic knowledge and Excerpts 4.21 and 4.22 are parts of her interaction with the professor.

> Excerpt 4.20. Sue: Since I do not know their (native English speakers') culture, so I do not know how exactly the professor understood my words. I am not sure if she really understood what I said.

Excerpt 4.21 (Extracted from Sue-prof#2)

```
23→  Sue     ahhhh (0.4) uh it it sounds ((raises eyebrows)) a
24           really good chance bu:t ((smiles)) (0.4) uh I (0.2)
25           pla:n to:: tra:vel:: to SPA:IN hhh
```

Excerpt 4.22 (Extracted from Sue-prof#2)

```
50→  Sue     oh ((avoids eye contact)) yes but I ((smiles)) after
51           ((raises eyebrows)) (0.4) after next year (0.2)
52           ummmm I::ll hhh (0.2) I'll get a job
```

Sue expresses her uncertainties in the L2 pragmatics in Excerpt 4.20, showing that she is aware of the different pragmatics, but does not have enough L2 pragmatic knowledge to judge if her refusal sounded appropriate or not. On the contrary to her report, the native English speakers found her performances to be

appropriate and polite. As seen in her interaction with the professor in Excerpts 4.21 and 4.22, Sue frequently tried to start with saying something positive and used pro forma agreement "oh yes but" before a dispreferred response. These features were noticed by the interlocutors in that they rated her attempts high. Additionally, she expressed appreciations to the professor with an excuse and apologized to the friend; these behaviors made her look more sincere, thus her refusals sounded more polite and acceptable. Therefore, contrary to Sue's uncertainties both interlocutors thought her refusals were sincere and polite.

Another type of mismatch occurred when the students were sure of successfully conveying their intentions whereas the interlocutors did not interpret their refusals the same way. Excerpt 4.23 presents a verbal report from a more advanced learner James and Excerpt 4.24 the interaction between James and the professor.

> Excerpt 4.23. James: I think I said what I intended to say fairly well. I felt that they (the interlocutors) got what I was saying, and since they were trying to insist something they looked like going around my point of saying. But other than that, I wanted them to catch that because of the reasons that I explain I am refusing their request.

Excerpt 4.24 (Extracted from James-prof#1)

```
44   James    BU:::T (0.8) but ((gazes to the left)) I:::
45            ((raises both hands in the air)) >know that< the
46            curriculum (0.3) for this class and ((gestures
47            with hands)) (0.3) [another class is a little=
```

```
48   Pam                          [((nods))
49   James    =bit different so um:: I prefe::r ((puts both
50            hands front)) you:::::r lecture ((smiles))
51   Pam      aw ((smiles)) thank [you
52→  James                         [so I cannot change it
53   Pam      well we have um ((touches her chin)) (0.5) a
54            textbook ((puts LH in the air)) (0.5) that we
55            sha:re we use the SAme textbook so >the curriculum
56            is< is GEnera:lly ((nods)) it's mostly the same
57→  James    bu::t ((smiles)) I don't want the ((puts RH in the
58            air)) othe:r (0.2) teacher's (0.2) class
```

Despite James' confidence in Excerpt 4.23, native English speakers judged his performances otherwise. Some of his turns that were evaluated as inappropriate are displayed in Excerpt 4.24. James's utterance in line 52 sounded too strong and thus rude to the professor. Nothing prohibits James from changing the course except his own desire; thus, the use of "I cannot" may sound inappropriate in the context. Then, as the professor assures that the other course has an identical curriculum, James says that he does not want the other teacher's class in lines 57-58. The expression "I don't want to" was interpreted as a protest, thus seen as an immature and ineffective argument. The professor thought that this utterances sounded too juvenile for a college student speaking to his professor. Further, it indicated that the student has given up hope of getting his way.

Other instances of this type of mismatch share similar features; students' use of linguistic forms that are not appropriate in the context made their performances sound awkward, rude, or sometimes too aggressive. These instances

occurred on the bases of learners' lack of pragmalinguistic knowledge. They failed to consider the pragmatic functions of the linguistic forms that they used. Learners' failure to use linguistically appropriate forms was also discussed by Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1993). While exploring the different academic talks between native English students and non-native students longitudinally, they remarked on how acquiring polite, appropriate utterances takes longer than learning the structures of the talks. They noted that this may be due to the fact that no explicit teaching takes place regarding these politeness markers. Additionally, they discovered how even when faced with an inappropriate utterance from the non-native student, the advisor tended to attend to the intended meaning rather than the form. Thus, this absence of negative feedback nor explicit learning prevented learners from learning the appropriate linguistic forms. Similar to these discussions, Excerpt 4.24 shows how the professor does not provide a negative feedback on James' inappropriate uses of certain linguistic forms. Rather than telling James about his inappropriate utterances on the spot, she continues, trying to focus on the intended force.

The two types of mismatches indicate that learners were not always successful at performing refusals. There was no clear relation between the learners' proficiency and the (mis)matches; a few of both more and less advanced learners failed to refuse the interlocutor's request appropriately. This implies that not only how well the learners structure sentences but also how the learners empathize with

the interlocutor and seem sincere in what they say is important. These mismatches derive from either lack of L2 pragmatic knowledge or lack of pragmatic sensitiveness. The unsuccessful delivery of learners' intentions may have derived mostly from learners' insufficient or lack of L2 pragmalinguistic information. The native English speakers' comments related to how the learners failed to detect the different pragmatic functions of the linguistic forms. The (in)appropriateness stems from how the learners were not adequately equipped with this information. To develop their L2 pragmatic competence, it might be suggested that they need to have more L2 pragmatic knowledge as well as be aware of the importance of L2 pragmatic knowledge.

4.3.2 Attended Features: Learner Difficulties

This section analyzes to which features the participants attended while they were engaged in the role-plays. In the present study, the attended features were examined through focusing on the learners' responses to what factor made the refusal performances the most difficult. Addressing their difficulties and the reasons behind those difficulties may imply that those features were what they primarily noticed and were aware of during their interactions.

Their responses are categorized into the linguistic difficulties and the pragmatic difficulties that the refusing act invokes. The pragmatic difficulties include any kind of difficulties that relate to the relationship with the interlocutor

and to the act of refusing. Ten participants attributed the cause of the difficulties to pragmatic factors while six attributed the cause to linguistic factors; among the six students who chose linguistic factors as the source of trouble, two were less proficient and four were more proficient. Thus, more learners referred to pragmatic difficulties.

Excerpt 4.25 is from the verbal report of a more proficient learner attributing the cause of the task difficulties to pragmatic features.

> Excerpt 4.25. Hong: Especially with the professor, the interpersonal relationship was the most difficult one. There's a hierarchy between the professor and me, a student. She is superior to the students. Also there may be some advantages in the end when I do as I am told. Usually, in Korea this is a very big thing for students. Any student who is willing to be successful in one's college years would always feel the need to keep a good relationship with the professors. So refusing a professor is really difficult.

Hong explains how the relationship with the professor, thus refusing someone face-to-face, was what made the task difficult. His answer hints at what may be prevalent among Korean university students. He mentions that there is a hierarchical relationship between a professor and a student. This imbalance between the two conversers influence the student's attitude and behavior towards the professor. His answer shows his sensitivity to a higher status. Despite Hong's difficulties of refusing a professor, the interlocutor noted how he offered flattering reasons instead of saying negative comments about others and also how he first

suggested to help her out before mentioning an alternative. According to the interlocutor, this made her want to help him out. Although his difficulty did not make his performances sound rude, it resulted in a failure to refuse the professor.

Previous research discussed various results regarding which features the learners attended to (Ren, 2014; Robinson, 1992; Woodfield, 2010, 2012). Robinson (1992) and Ren (2014) reported that language learners attended to pragmatics. Robinson (1992) explained that there were less reports on linguistic difficulties and more on pragmatic difficulties. Ren (2014) noted how learners had difficulties in their inaccurate pragmatic knowledge. Moreover, Woodfield (2010, 2012) discussed how learners attended to both linguistic aspects and pragmatic aspects, explaining that learners who attended to linguistic aspects focused on the lexico-grammar components whereas those who focused on pragmatic aspects were mainly concerned with choosing the appropriate forms.

The current study indicates that more learners focused on the pragmatic aspects while there were still several learners who attended to linguistic aspects. In addition to the linguistic difficulties that they faced, the majority of the participants' responses from the present study's data imply 1) their awareness of the pragmatic differences and 2) their awareness of lack of their L2 pragmatic knowledge. Not knowing enough about the American culture but at the same time being aware of the existence of pragmatic differences makes them struggle when they are to refuse someone.

4.3.3 Knowledge about Refusals

The students' responses on their perceptions about how one should refuse to another person's request are analyzed in this section. Robinson (1992) focused specifically on investigating the participants' knowledge about American English refusals; however, in the current study, the participants' general knowledge about refusals were examined. Additionally, the participants responded about whether their interactions (i.e. expressions and/or excuses) would have been different if they were situated in a Korean speaking context.

When asked whether they would have reacted similarly in Korean, the majority answered that there would not be any significant differences in their refusal performances. While this was prevalent particularly in the role-plays with the friend, there were slightly more participants who reported their different sensitivity towards the professor concerning language. Fifteen participants responded that their interactions with the friend in both English and Korean would be similar whereas ten stated that their refusals to the professor in English would resemble those in Korean. About refusing the professor differently in Korean, they mentioned honorifics to explain how the honorifics affect their behavior. They reported that due to the different language forms, they become more aware of the different power relations with the interlocutor, thus sensing the need to be polite and formal. They expressed how they feel that the relationship between a professor

and a student is usually hierarchical; thus, a student needs to be polite to the professor and to use formal expressions. Compared to the friendships, this type of relationship burdened the students. Consequently, students felt more pressure throughout their refusals and some students reported that they had the pressure that they need to deliver their utterances in complete, grammatical sentences.

Further, the students answered about what they think consists of an appropriate refusal. The most frequently mentioned characteristics of appropriate refusals are 1) empathizing with the interlocutor's situation, 2) trying one's best not to hurt the interlocutor's feelings, 3) emphasizing that s/he tried one's best, and 4) providing a valid excuse to imply that the refusal is due to external factors.

Excerpts 4.26 and 4.27 are extracted from verbal reports of more advanced learners.

> Excerpt 4.26. Rissa: I think an appropriate refusal is to show my sincerity to the interlocutor. Also, having a big excuse, an important, strong excuse is good.

> Excerpt 4.27. Hong: An appropriate refusal, first you need to succeed in refusing, would be to not hurt the person's feelings. Not making them feel bad is important. Also, if that interlocutor is a person that I need to remain a good relationship with, then I need to make him/her understand my situation. So refusing without offending them is important and in order to do that, I need to have an objective reason that s/he would be able to accept as well.

As shown in the excerpts above, many participants reported that showing

the interlocutor a sense of empathy is important. The interlocutors in the role-plays were faced with a problem in each context which led them to request something to the participants. The participants recognized that the interlocutors encountered some kind of difficulties, so expressing their understanding and empathy is important. In Rissa's refusals, she constantly tried to empathize with the interlocutors, especially to the friend. When hearing the interlocutor's situations, Rissa uttered expressions such as "oh really?" and "oh no" as a reaction to the interlocutor's announcements. The interlocutor who played the role of the friend noted on Rissa's empathic behaviors in her interactions. In addition to empathizing with the interlocutor, they believe that they need to avoid hurting the interlocutor's feelings. This implies how the participants are aware that a refusal is a face-threatening act. Thus, they regard being less offensive an important characteristic of a refusal.

Excerpts 4.28 and 4.29 are from verbal reports of more advanced learners and these answers refer to their preferences towards providing certain types of excuses for the refusals.

> Excerpt 4.28. Vlada: I think an appropriate refusal would be to convey the message that it's not because I don't want to comply but there are external factors so I have no other choices but to refuse.

> Excerpt 4.29. Haley: Refusing someone is really difficult for me. I would try to make him/her know that I would really want to help you but there

are practical reasons. I use very indirect strategies when I refuse.

In the excerpts, Vlada and Haley believe that they need to emphasize that the refusal is due to an external factor. This is relevant to how most students think that it is important to not hurt the interlocutor's feelings. In her refusals to the professor, Vlada provided her more urgent schedules such as working on her thesis papers and explained that she does not have much time to spend on other events. The interlocutor found this to be an acceptable and understandable excuse and noted that her refusal strategies were appropriate and persuasive. In Haley's interactions, she repeatedly uses the expression "I wish I could help" or "I really want to help you but" in order to express her willingness to help, followed by elaborations of accounts or excuses. The interlocutors also remarked on her understanding behaviors and commented that by first expressing her wishes to help but unfortunately she cannot do so for some reasons sounded nice.

The majority of the students repeatedly mentioned how it may hurt the interlocutor's feelings if they refuse because they don't want to comply with the interlocutor's requests. These characteristics of what they think of an appropriate refusal intertwine together in that they collaborate in making the refusals less offensive.

4.3.4 Pragmatic Knowledge and Pragmatic Awareness

The students had a chance to reflect on their pragmatic knowledge, which shows how much they are aware of their pragmatic competence, as well as the sources that provided them these pragmatic knowledge. Their answers on whether they know cultural differences between the two cultures are categorized as their L2 pragmatic knowledge; further, their pragmatic knowledge is subdivided into pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge. Then, apart from their L2 pragmatic knowledge, verbal reports that provide information on whether they are aware of different pragmatics are categorized as their L2 pragmatic awareness. It also includes data that relate to whether they consider this aspect during the interactions. Finally, for those who reported that they have partial L2 pragmatic knowledge, the source of their acquisition of L2 pragmatics is analyzed.

Throughout the RVRs, the pragmatic aspects were referred to as culture-related aspects for the students do not seem to consider their pragmatic knowledge apart from their cultural knowledge. They used terms such as 'cultural differences' or 'cultural background' when referring to the pragmatic aspects. The excerpts from the students' interviews were literally translated using the term 'culture' while in the analysis, their cultural knowledge is referred to as pragmatic knowledge.

Ten learners responded to have at least partial knowledge of the pragmatics. Moreover, twelve students appeared to be aware of the different pragmatics. Most learners who reported as having some pragmatic knowledge or who were found to

have pragmatic awareness referred to the pragmalinguistic aspects. Not many learners mentioned the sociopragmatics in their verbal reports.

Excerpt 4.30 displays a part of the verbal report from John, a less proficient learner, who does not have L2 pragmatic knowledge, and Excerpt 4.31 is from his interaction with the professor.

> Excerpt 4.30. John: I don't think I know the cultural differences. … I think because of that, I don't know how to say what I want. That's why I think I'm not good at speaking English.

Excerpt 4.31 (Extracted from John2-prof#1)

```
59   John    °ahhh° ((avoids eye contact)) (2.0) uh but (sighs)
60           uh why (0.2) uh (0.6) >I think there are< many
61           ((gestures with both hands)) (0.2) stu:dents at the
62→          same situation like me . but . why should why should
63           I:: (0.2) change (0.8) yeah (0.8) why why me
```

John reports not knowing pragmatic knowledge. Nevertheless, from the excerpt, it can be seen that he is aware that L2 pragmatic knowledge is related to the speaking ability. John perceives that one of the causes of his relatively low speaking ability is due to not having L2 pragmatic knowledge. His verbal reports explain some of his interactions with the professor. John was one of the participants who showed struggles with searching for the right vocabulary. This interrupted him from focusing solely on the refusing tasks. In Excerpt 4.31, John

stutters several times in expressing what he wants to say. From his repetition of the word "why" it can be seen that he is making an attempt to form a sentence to ask the professor why the professor is asking him to change the class and not other students. Since there were several pauses in his turn, the professor noticed that this was a moment where John struggled with English. Thus, she regarded this as a struggle with linguistic difficulty; nonetheless, she noted that the form "why should I" might be interpreted as demanding and challenging especially when produced to a professor. If it were not for his proficiency, she remarked on this form to be challenging the authority and hence offensive. Additionally, structuring his turn with the combination of "but" and a reason was perceived to be a protest, not a refusal, by the interlocutors. Without any devices preceding the combination of "but" and a reason, the interlocutors noted that there is a possibility that it might sound like a childish protest. Although not completely inappropriate, John's turns included some inappropriate expressions or forms that might be due to his insufficient pragmatic knowledge.

Excerpt 4.32 displays a less advanced learner's verbal report of having some L2 pragmatic knowledge.

> Excerpt 4.32. Grace: I don't know about the cultural differences. … I also don't apply my (lack) of knowledge when I speak. … But I think that sometimes if I speak indirectly, 'no' may not be apparent in the American culture. I remember that in American movies they always said 'no' clearly. But in Korean, we mean 'no' by giving excuses or reasons but in English that's not the case.

Grace is among the students who reported to have some pragmatic knowledge. According to her response, she turns out to have more pragmatic knowledge than she acknowledges. On the contrary to her perceptions, she has the notion that unlike Koreans, Americans have a tendency to be clearer in refusing, showing that she is aware of some different features. She mostly used indirect expressions in her interactions. Only in two circumstances she expressed "I can't" or "I won't" and in other turns, she mostly employed other devices such as hedges, pauses, apologies or elaborations on accounts and reasons. Despite her partial knowledge on the degree of directness in English, her expressions "I can't" and "I won't" sounded direct. In her interaction with the friend, she used this expression with much mitigations, thus minimizing the boldness of the expression "I can't." The interlocutor did not note her utterance to be impolite. When interacting with the professor, her expression "I won't" sounded too direct to the professor; apart from other turns, the professor remarked that this single turn may sound impolite, but Grace's prior and subsequent turns were milder and more indirect, reducing any offensiveness that "I won't" may have carried. Her uses of direct and indirect expressions and the interlocutors' comments indicate that Grace's indirect expressions were not interpreted as inappropriate and also that her direct refusal might sound bold when separated from other turns, but the directness is mitigated as the interaction continues.

Students who answered that they are aware of the differences resemble Grace's answers. They explain how they have heard the degree of directness differs between Korean and American culture. This knowledge of the degree of directness in English belongs to the pragmalinguistic knowledge in that it is regarded as "the more linguistic end of pragmatics" (Leech, 1983, p. 11).

The majority of the learners seem to be aware of the existence of the different pragmatics and also feel the need to behave and speak according to the appropriate pragmatics when interacting with a person of a different culture. Students mention the linguistic aspects such as expressions, the degree of directness, and strategies regarding their L2 pragmatic knowledge. These components are all related to the pragmalinguistic aspects; several learners consider themselves to know the different language uses in general and others, while not having enough L2 pragmatic knowledge, were aware that they need different pragmalinguistic knowledge when talking in English.

Excerpt 4.33 is from a less advanced learner's verbal report which hints the learner's awareness of different sociopragmatics.

> Excerpt 4.33. Cindy: Honestly, I think talking to a Korean professor is trickier than talking to a foreign professor. I just feel that the distance between me and the foreign professor is not that far. I also tend to think that a foreigner is more open-minded. So I feel more comfortable talking to a foreign professor than to a Korean professor.

When asked to compare her refusals in English and refusals in Korean, Cindy mentions the distance that she felt with the native English speaker and compare that with her experiences with a Korean professor. Despite the fact that she cannot provide the exact reason for her perceptions, she recognizes some sociopragmatic differences. Her answer implies that she does not regard her relationship with the American interlocutor hierarchical and this made her feel more comfortable.

Those who have some cultural background report that these pieces of cultural and pragmatic background affect their way of speaking. They say that they think about what is appropriate or what is not before they produce their utterance. As for the students who report that they do not think they have any pragmatic knowledge, they still seem to be conscious about the gap that exists between the two cultures. They mention that pragmatic differences are present, but they do not know what the differences are. It was seen in Excerpt 4.30 where John perceives this as a possible factor for having difficulties in speaking English.

Unlike the majority, two learners responded that they did not feel the necessity of L2 pragmatic knowledge. This is shown in Excerpt 4.34 which is extracted from verbal reports of a less advanced learner.

> Excerpt 4.34. Kimmy: I don't know about the American cultures. … I think the pragmatics would be important only when you are above a certain level in which you are able to speak whatever you want in English as well as in Korean. But I'm not in that level, so I think expressing what I want is more

important for me. At this stage.

As presented in Excerpt 4.33, Kimmy is more concerned about her linguistic competence in that she perceives herself to be a lower level English student. Furthermore, she believes that knowing how to convey one's meanings appropriately with the appropriate pragmatics is for the advanced level students who are capable of saying what they want without much linguistic difficulties.

Her perceptions were evident in her interactions as well as the native English speakers' judgments. Several of her turns consisted of inappropriate forms or behaviors. For instance, an expression that the professor regarded as a challenge to her authority was "why don't you." The professor noted that this expression sounds like a command, thus challenging the authority of the counterpart. She found this turn to be rude, adding that her poorly formed sentence that followed this expression may excuse her word choice due to a lack of English skills. Moreover, as for Kimmy's interactions with the friend, the interlocutor notes on how Kimmy did not sound sincere or sympathetic. She did not express any empathy towards the interlocutor. In spite of her expressions that sound as if she understood and empathized with the interlocutor, her facial expressions, gestures and tones did not match her words. Thus, the interlocutor did not think Kimmy was caring. This shows why having appropriate L2 pragmatic knowledge as well as being aware of the importance of L2 pragmatics is important. Although her

somewhat awkward linguistic expressions may serve as an excuse for her impolite behavior, this still influences how the interlocutors judge her.

More advanced learners tended to be more aware of the different pragmatic aspects. Excerpt 4.35 is extracted from the verbal reports of Chris, a more advanced learner.

> Excerpt 4.35 Chris: When I was to refuse, I felt the need to be indirect. However, I said things without having time to think about it, so at times I was confused whether I did not express too directly. Also, sometimes I was not sure how to interpret the interlocutor's questions such as "are you sure about that?" … I try to say differently in Korean and English. In Korean there is no corresponding expression that expresses one's regret such as 'I'm sorry about' and we don't use this in Korean. However, in English there are expressions for that and they use it often. It's not that I memorize any of the expression consciously and use them, but I tend to use them when I remember hearing that expression before. One thing for sure, I try to speak differently.

Chris was the only student who showed pragmatic knowledge as well as pragmatic awareness; further, the awareness of her L2 pragmatic knowledge was overall consistent with her performances. She displayed L2 pragmalinguistic knowledge in that she deliberately chose different strategies and expressions in her refusals in English. Although in the excerpt she shows uncertainty about how appropriate her degree of directness was, she is conscious of her different choices of strategies and expressions, and she also gives an example of the different pragmatic knowledge that she has. She is aware that there are different types of

expressions that exist in a particular language and remembers to use those expressions when she is communicating in that language.

Chris projected her refusals in various ways and her attempts at refusing the professor and the friend were regarded by the interlocutors to be appropriate and nicely performed. None of her turns were judged as inappropriate or rude. Her acknowledging the situation and showing an understanding made the interlocutors feel that Chris is siding with them. This maintains the solidarity between the two conversers. In addition, projecting a wish, an apology or a flattery before a dispreferred response evidences Chris' knowledge of appropriate strategies as well as her competence. She uses expressions such as "I'm really not sure if I can do it," "I'm not sure about that," and "I really cannot do this" in addition to elaborations, hedges and mitigations, wishes, apologies, and positive remarks. This displays her capability of projecting dispreferred sequences in a number of ways which are all appropriate and polite. Her knowledge on L2 pragmatics as well as her L2 pragmatic awareness resulted in her refusal performances in that both native English speakers regarded Chris' interactions were the most natural, without any problematic or awkward utterances or behaviors.

Additionally, as for the sociopragmatics, her response shows that sometimes she felt uncertain about how to interpret the native English speaker's utterances. The expression that she mentions as an example was the interlocutor's utterance "are you sure about that." She expresses her confusion on how to

interpret this sentence. It seemed that she was not sure whether this utterance should be taken as insisting. Although she was confused with this specific form, it did not interrupt with her interactions. Thus, it did not result in any misunderstanding or miscommunication.

The results from the present study is in line with the discussions from the previous literature (Hassall, 2008; Robinson, 1992; Widjaja, 1997; Woodfield, 2010, 2012). These studies discuss how language learners' pragmatic knowledge was either inaccurate or insufficient. Widjaja (1997) refers to learners' inaccurate L2 pragmatic knowledge that led to miscommunications. Research that categorized the sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics from learners' data suggests that learners report to have some background knowledge on the sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics while they were still concerned with the persuasiveness of their utterances (Robinson, 1992) and that there was L1 transfer in the sociopragmatics and learners' written response does not always display learners' appropriate pragmalinguistic knowledge (Woodfield, 2010, 2012).

The students that reported to have pragmatic knowledge referred to the source of gaining their knowledge to two sources: media such as movies and TV shows and relationships with native speakers. First, most students mentioned that they enjoyed watching American movies or TV shows; by watching many different works or watching same ones repeatedly, they noticed some characteristics in the behaviors and the attitudes of the American actors. Some

students mentioned that they detected how native speakers of English were more direct and clear in saying "no." Another source was being involved in relationships with native speakers. Several students explained that they have many friends whose L1 is English. Engaging in conversations with the native speakers, they sensed some differences directly. In short, the students gained pragmatic knowledge outside of the classrooms. Students who sought for additional L2 input turned out to have gained pragmatic knowledge.

This chapter discussed learners' refusals via oral role-plays focusing on the interlocutors' different statuses and the learners' proficiencies. Consequently, verbal and nonverbal features as well as sequencing turn structures differ according to the interlocutors' statuses. Additionally, learners of different proficiency levels showed different linguistic capabilities in producing their utterances as well as different ability to empathize with the interlocutor. Then, data collected via RVR was analyzed in order to examine learners' intentions underlying their interactions as well as their perceptions on L2 pragmatics. While most learners successfully delivered their intentions, there were learners who failed to sound appropriate; they were aware of the differences in the pragmatics while they were less confident in their L2 pragmatic knowledge. The following chapter summarizes the current study and discusses the implications from the analyses.

5. Conclusion

This chapter consists of two sections. In Section 5.1, the summaries of this study's findings and implications are presented. Section 5.2 explains the limitations of the current study and provides suggestions for further studies.

5.1 Major Findings and Implications

The present study aimed to investigate Korean EFL learners' L2 pragmatic competence in regard to their oral refusal performances. First, this study aimed to analyze how the Korean learners of English perform refusals to persons of different statuses. Additionally, it set out to examine the refusals of learners of two different proficiency levels. Finally, it sought to explore the learners' L2 pragmatic knowledge and pragmatic awareness.

In order to examine the research questions of the current study, sixteen Korean university students, seven less advanced and nine more advanced Korean EFL learners, engaged in open role-plays with two native English speakers in status-equal and status-unequal situations. The audio- and video-recorded data were transcribed and analyzed using the conversation analysis framework. Further, the participants participated in RVR with the purpose of probing into the learners' L2 pragmatic knowledge and pragmatic awareness.

There were similarities and differences regarding the interlocutor's status as well as regarding the learners' proficiencies. Learners of all proficiencies

employed elaborations of excuses, reasons, and accounts prevalently in their refusals to both interlocutors. Another strategy that was frequently used was the use of suggesting alternatives.

The results regarding the learners' refusal performances according to two different power relations confirmed previous literature's discussion on Korean EFL learners' sensitivity towards status (Kim, 2004; Kwon, 2004; Lee, 2013). First, there were different outcomes in the interactions. More learners failed to refuse the professor indicating that learners are status sensitive; they found the task of refusing the professor more difficult. Moreover, learners' degree of directness was different. They tended to be more direct in refusing to the friend than to the professor. Further, learners' projection of insert expansion particularly to the professor imply that the learners tried to delay their refusals. Insert expansions delay the projection of a dispreferred response. Lastly, learners showed different gaze behaviors. Gaze aversion, accompanied by pause fillers, pauses or other markers, was a prevailing behavior found in the interactions with the professor.

Then, the refusals of learners of different proficiencies were compared. As discussed in the refusals to persons of two different statuses, learners employed elaborations and alternatives the most. One of the differences concerns learners' different linguistic ability. Their turn lengths were compared and it was found that the more advanced were capable of controlling language and capable of producing relatively well-formed, long turns. Another feature was the presence of learners'

linguistic difficulties. The less advanced learners employed some strategies such as using pauses and pause fillers to search for vocabulary that hint at their struggles on linguistic aspects. The frequencies of learners' intra-turn pauses differed. The less advanced learners placed their pauses in between words more frequently compared to the more advanced learners. Finally, a difference that relates to both the learners' different proficiencies as well as the interlocutor's different statuses is the statement of empathy. The more advanced learners expressed empathy towards the friend and this coincides with their RVRs where they responded that an appropriate refusal should come with understanding the interlocutor's situations and being empathic.

In the learners' verbal reports, many learners regarded their interactions to be appropriate while some showed uncertainty and others did not think they performed successfully. When compared with the native English speakers' remarks, most learners' interactions were perceived as appropriate and polite while a few learners' interactions were perceived otherwise. Learners' focus of attention was mainly on the pragmatic aspects while several learners attended to the linguistic aspects. Moreover, they repeatedly expressed their sensitivity towards the status; they considered an appropriate refusal to the professor needs to be polite and formal with clear reasons while an appropriate refusal to a friend or in general requires the speaker to be empathic and understanding, showing one's willingness to help. Furthermore, more than half of the participants reported

that they have some pragmatic knowledge at the least and despite their incomplete L2 pragmatic knowledge they turned out to be aware of pragmatic differences. Their pragmatic knowledge or pragmatic awareness were mostly related to the pragmalinguistic aspects whereas only a few learners were aware of the different sociopragmatics. Learners were aware that refusals in English would have different characteristics from those in Korean but were uncertain what those differences were as well as whether their utterances sounded appropriate.

Based on the findings of the present study, several implications can be drawn. Regarding the methodologies employed in this study, the findings imply that open role-plays can provide in-depth analysis on the features of learners' refusals as well as their pragmatic competences compared to methods such as written or oral DCTs. Since open role-plays enable the learners to exchange turns with the interlocutor, the data presents the learners' diverse use of multiple strategies and the presence of various verbal and nonverbal features that may not have been observed in a single turn task. When conducted via either written or oral DCTs, studies could not observe various aspects of the learners' interactions because these methodologies focus on the learners' single turn. Additionally, eliciting a written response would not have been able to detect numerous use of silences and pause fillers as an oral response would have done.

Regarding the features of Korean EFL learners' refusals, it should be noted that comparing the non-native English speakers' refusals to the native English

speakers' refusals needs to be carefully interpreted. In most previous literature, researchers sought to compare and contrast the native speakers' and the non-native speakers' speech act performances in the strategies and the contents. Using strategies different from the native English speakers in the refusal performances do not always lead to unusual or awkward consequences. Resembling the native speakers' performances is not the ultimate goal in learning a language. What should be taken into consideration is how the interlocutor perceives the learners' refusal performances. As long as the learners' interactions are regarded as acceptable by the interlocutors, their refusals are not problematic.

The participants' tendency to depend on elaborating on the excuses and reasons helped them to sound less direct and more polite to the interlocutors. Learners' attempt to delay their refusals by fronting hedges, mitigations and elaborations also avoided their refusals to sound rude. It can be noted that their linguistic ability may not be the primary factor for the interlocutor judging the appropriateness of the learners' utterances. Their more or less proficient linguistic ability is revealed in their performances, but the native English speakers focused more on the politeness or appropriateness of the expressions rather than the learners' grammaticality. It is equally important for the learners to know that interacting with others requires more than solely the grammaticality of their language uses. Even without grammatically perfect utterances, they are able to convey their messages successfully and appropriately. Hence, students need to be

less preoccupied with producing accurate linguistic forms and more informed about other factors that may affect an interaction.

The learners' reports on their perceptions also shed light on what they think of their interactions as well as refusals in general. The majority of learners' self-judgments on their performances matched the comments made by the native English speakers, implying that these learners are capable of conveying their messages without major problems. Nonetheless, there were also mismatches where some learners were uncertain of their performances and where some failed to refuse appropriately to the interlocutors. Both instances may be due to their inadequate L2 pragmatic knowledge. Those who were not sure that they behaved appropriately were uncertain because they were not sure what counts as an appropriate behavior. Likewise, students whose behaviors were judged inappropriate also did not know how to behave appropriately. These inappropriate behaviors in particular relate to the learners' lack of L2 pragmalinguistic knowledge. Since they were not aware of the pragmatic functions of certain expressions, they uttered those expressions without considering the effects those expressions would have on the interlocutor. Without appropriate L2 pragmatic knowledge nor pragmatic awareness, there is a possibility that their performances may lead to misunderstandings. The interlocutors might misinterpret their behaviors and consider them rude or offensive.

Further, while not many learners regarded themselves as pragmatically

competent, they were sensitive towards the different pragmatics in that they constantly thought of trying not to sound inappropriate to the interlocutors. They were aware of the existence of pragmatic differences at the least; however, since they do not know what the pragmatic differences are, they were often uncertain of what is considered as appropriate and thus accepted in English.

These uncertainties in L2 pragmatics suggest the need for more guidance or instruction. To raise their awareness on L2 pragmatics as well as to enhance their L2 pragmatic competence, they need more opportunities to be exposed to these different L2 pragmatics. Throughout the students' RVR, it has been noticed that they were mostly aware of the pragmalinguistic differences between Korean and English while they confessed that they do not exactly know the differences. This is consistent with some of the learners' inappropriate performances; the native English speakers remarked on the pragmatic functions of some of the learners' expressions that sounded inappropriate and rude. Thus, more instructions are needed to encourage the students to acquire the different pragmatic aspects when they learn English. By doing so, they can be aware of the pragmatic functions of each expressions and use them appropriately in context.

5.2 Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Research

The findings from this study provide in-depth information on how Korean EFL learners refused the request of a native speaker of English in a face to face

interaction as well as on their perceptions on their pragmatic knowledge. Nevertheless, there are drawbacks that can be improved in further studies.

Firstly, despite employing open role-plays as an attempt to replace written DCTs, open role-plays are not without drawbacks. Open role-plays were designed in order to engage the participants in more natural, authentic interactions, but in an open role-play setting the issue of authenticity arises. There is an argument that the interactions in the role-plays are not consequential, authentic, or natural (Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012; Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 2005; Félix-Brasdefer, 2007; Gass, & Houck, 1999; Huth, 2010; Kasper & Youn, 2017). According to this argument, role-plays cannot represent natural, authentic interactions in real life. Nonetheless, Golato (2017) claims that role-plays are approximations of actual conversation and these interactions may be less natural when compared to the natural data. Ewald (2012), Bataller (2013), Stokoe (2013), and Hassall (in press) examine the role-play data with natural data and discovers that there are both similarities and differences between the two different data. Nevertheless, role-plays have strengths in that they resemble authentic conversations and enable the researcher to analyze how the participants structure their turns and sequences.

Secondly, the current study analyzed the performances of sixteen Korean EFL students through four role-plays and RVRs. With a greater number of participants, it would be possible to classify the learners into a finer classification of proficiency levels. In particular, this study classified sixteen participants into

relatively more and less proficient students; in the future research, having a finer classification would allow the research to investigate the different performances among the proficiency levels. Additionally, further research with a better control of the situational contexts as to how many tasks are to be implemented and what types of requests or other speech acts are to be carried out would provide in-depth analysis on the learners' refusal performances.

There has not been much research on how Korean EFL learners refuse the interlocutor's request in an interaction. Further research needs to be conducted to explore the learners' performances, the influences of variables on their performances, as well as their perceptions.

References

Ahn, M. (2010). Korean ESL refusals in face-to-face interaction. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics, 26*(2), 123-152.

Al-Gahtani, S., & Roever, C. (2012). Proficiency and sequential organization of L2 requests. *Applied Linguistics, 33*(1), 42-65.

Al-Gahtani, S., & Roever, C. (2014). Preference structure in L2 Arabic requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 11*(4), 619-643.

Al-Gahtani, S., & Roever, C. (2018). Proficiency and preference organization in second language refusals. *Journal of Pragmatics, 129*, 140-153.

Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning, 49*(4), 677-713.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1990). Congruence in native and nonnative conversations: Status balance in the academic advising session. *Language Learning, 40*, 467-501.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1991). Saying “no” in English: Native and nonnative rejections. *Pragmatics and Language Learning, 2*, 41-57.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (1993). Learning the rules of academic talk: A longitudinal study of pragmatic change. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*, 279-304.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. S. (2005). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Exploring institutional talk*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bataller, R. (2013). Role-plays vs. natural data: Asking for a drink at a cafeteria in Peninsular Spanish. *Ikala, revista de lenguaje y cultura, 18*(2), 111-126.

Beebe, L., & Cummings, M. C. (1996). Natural speech act data versus written questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance. In S. M. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 65-86). Berlin: Mouton.

Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. C. Scarcella, E. S. Anderson, & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury House.

Billmyer, K., & Varghese, M. (2000). Investigating instrument-based pragmatic variability: Effects of enhancing discourse completion tests. *Applied Linguistics, 21*(4), 517-552.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics,*

5(3), 196-213.

Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1986). Too many words: Length of utterance and pragmatic failure. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 8*(2), 165-179.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied linguistics, 1*(1), 1-47.

Cappella, J. N. (1979). Talk–silence sequences in informal conversations I. *Human Communication Research, 6,* 130-145.

Chang, Y. F. (2009). How to say no: an analysis of cross-cultural difference and pragmatic transfer. *Language Sciences, 31*, 477-493.

Chen, X., Ye, L., & Zhang, Y. (1995). Refusing in Chinese. In G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics of Chinese as native and target language* (pp. 119-163). Technical Report #5. Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center. Honolulu, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Chung, B., & Min., S. (2013). Pragmatic transfer in refusal strategies by Korean learners of English. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society, 12*(2), 129-147.

Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 33-56.

Crystal, D., (1985). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Culpeper, J., Mackey, A., & Taguchi, N. (2018). *Second language pragmatics: From theory to research*. New York: Routledge.

Edmondson, W., House, J., Kasper, G., & Stemmer, B. (1984). Learning the pragmatics of discourse: A project report. *Applied Linguistics, 5*(2), 113-127.

Ewald, J. D. (2012). "Can you tell me how to get there?": Naturally-occurring versus role-play data in direction-giving. *Pragmatics, 22*(1), 79-102.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2006). *Speech Act Perception in Interlanguage Pragmatics: Exploring the Minds of Foreign Language Learners*. LAUD.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2007). Pragmatic development in the Spanish as a FL classroom: A cross-sectional study of learner requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 4*, 253-286.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2008). Perceptions of refusals to invitations: Exploring the minds of foreign language learners. *Language Awareness, 17*(3), 195-211.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2009). Dispreferred responses in interlanguage pragmatics refusal sequences in learner-NS interactions. *Applied Language Learning, 19*(1), 1-27.

Fouser, R. J. (1995). Interlanguage politeness: Towards a research agenda for Korea. *English Teaching, 50*(3), 17-39.

Gass, S. M., & Houck, N. (1999). *Interlanguage refusals: A cross-cultural study of Japanese-English*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2016). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. New York: Routledge.

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course (Second Edition)*. Mahwah, NJe: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Golato, A. (2017). Naturally occurring data. In B. Anne, G. Yueguo, & S. Gerard (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 21-26). London: Routledge.

Haddington, P. (2006). The organization of gaze and assessments as resources for stance taking. *Text & Talk, 26*(3), 281-328.

Hall, E. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Doubleday, Garden City, NY: Doubleday

Hassall, T. (2003). Requests by Australian learners of Indonesian. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*, 1903-1928.

Hassall, T. (2008). Pragmatic performance: What are learners thinking?. In E. A. Soler & A.M. Flor (Eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 72-93). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hassall, T. (in press). Preference structure in request sequences: What about

role-play?. *Journal of Pragmatics*, http://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.02.020.

Hawkins, P. R. (1971). The syntactic location of hesitation pauses. *Language and Speech, 14*, 277-288.

Heath, C., & Luff, P. (2013). Embodied action and organizational activity. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 283-307). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Heldner, M., & Edlund, J. (2010). Pauses, gaps and overlaps in conversations. *Journal of Phonetics, 38*, 555-568.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J., & Atkinson, J. M. (1984). Introduction. In. J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2008). *Talk in action*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Huth, T. (2010). Can talk be inconsequential? Social and interactional aspects of elicited second-language interaction. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*, 537-553.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity.

Hymes, D. (1966). Two types of linguistic relativity. In W. Bright (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 114-158). The Hague: Mouton.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jung, E. H., & Kim, Y. J. (2008a). First language transfer in pragmatic use by second language speakers. *Korean Journal of Linguistics, 33*(3), 517-543.

Jung, E. H., & Kim, Y. J. (2008b). Refusal semantic formulas used by foreign language learners. *English Teaching, 63*(4), 115-139.

Kasper, G. (2000). Data collection in pragmatics research. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures* (pp. 316-341). New York, NY: Continuum.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies of Second Language Acquisition, 13*(2), 215-247.

Kasper, G., & Roever, C. (2005). Pragmatics in second language learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 317-334). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of*

Applied Linguistics, 19, 81-104.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in ILP. *Studies in Second language Acquisition, 18*, 149-169.

Kasper, G., & Youn, S. J. (2018). Transforming instruction to activity: Roleplay in language assessment. *Applied Linguistics Review, 9*(4), 589-616.

Kendon, A. (1967). Some functions of gaze-direction in social interaction. *Acta Psychologica, 26*, 22-63.

Kendrick, K. H., & Holler, J. (2017). Gaze direction signals response preference in conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 50*(1), 12-32.

Kim, K. (2004). Pragmatic transference in refusals. *Bilingualism, 26*, 23-44

Kim, Y. J. (2008). A Cross-cultural analysis of refusal strategy use between Korean EFL learners and native English speakers. Unpublished master's thesis, Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea.

Kim, J., & Kwon, Y. (2010). Pragmatic transfer in refusals: A comparative study of Korean and English. *English Language and Linguistics, 16*(1), 99-136.

Kitzinger, C. (2013). Repair. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 229-256). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Koo, J. H. (1992). The term of address "you: in South Korea today. *Korea*

Journal, *32*(1), 27-42.

Kormos, J. (1998). Verbal reports in L2 speech production research. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(2), 353-358.

Kormos, J., & Denes, M. (2004). Exploring measures and perceptions of fluency in the speech of second language learners. *System*, *32*, 145-164.

Kwon, J. (2004). Expressing refusals in Korean and in American English. *Multilingua*, *23*, 339-364.

Lee, H. (2013). The influence of social situations on fluency difficulty in Korean EFL learners' oral refusals. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *50*, 168-186.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Liao, C. C., & Bresnahan, M. I. (1996). A contrastive pragmatic study on American English and Mandarin refusal strategies. *Language sciences*, *18*(3-4), 703-727.

Liddicoat, A. (2011). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. London: Continuum.

Lindstrom, A., & Sorjonen, M. (2013). Affiliation in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 350-369). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lyuh, I. (1992). *The art of refusal: Comparison of Korean and American cultures*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Lyuh, I. (1994). A comparison of Korean and American refusal strategies.

English Teaching, 49, 221-251.

Min, S. (2013). A study on Korean EFL learners' refusal strategies with implication for interlanguage pragmatics. *Journal of the English Language and Literature, 57*(1), 353-76.

Nelson, G. L., Carson, J., Al Batal, M., & El Bakary, W. (2002). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Strategy use in Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(2), 163-189.

O'Keeffe, A., Clancy, B., & Adolphs, S. (2011). *Introducing pragmatics in use*. London: Routledge.

Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Bloomsbury.

Park, M. R. (1990). Conflict avoidance in social interaction: A sociolinguistic comparison of the Korean and Japanese honorific systems. In H. Hoji (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics*. (pp. 111-127). Standford, CA: CLS.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ren, W. (2014). A longitudinal investigation into L2 learners' cognitive processes during study abroad. *Applied Linguistics, 35*(5), 575-594.

Riggenbach, H. (1991). Toward an understanding of fluency: A microanalysis of nonnative speaker conversation. *Discourse Processes, 14*(4), 423-441.

Rossano, F. (2013). Gaze in conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 308-329). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ruusuvuori, J. (2013). Emotion, affect and conversation. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 330-349). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, *8*(4), 289-327.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53*(2), 361-382.

Stokoe, E. (2013). The (in)authenticity of simulated talk: comparing role-played and actual interaction and the implications for communication training. *Research on Language & Social Interaction. 46*(2), 165-185.

Taguchi, N. (2013). Refusals in L2 English: Proficiency effects on appropriateness and fluency. *Utrecht Studies in Language & Communication, 25*, 102-119.

Takahashi, T., & Beebe, L. M. (1987). The development of pragmatic competence by Japanese learners of English. *JALT journal*, *8*(2), 131-

155.

Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). *Request sequences: The interaction of grammar, interaction and social context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tanaka, S., & Kawade, S. (1982). Politeness strategies and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 5*(1), 18-33.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 91-112.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: a face-negotiation theory. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 47-92). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Widjaja, C. S. (1997). A study of date refusal: Taiwanese females vs. American females. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in EFL, 15*(2), 1-43.

Wen, X. (2014). Pragmatic development: An exploratory study of requests by learners of Chinese. In Z. Han (Ed.), *Studies in second language acquisition of Chinese* (pp. 30-56). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Won, M. K. (2012). Different politeness strategies in requests affected by experience of studying abroad. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society, 11*(1), 223-246.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. London: Routledge.

Appendices

Appendix A: Conversation-analytic Transcript Symbols (Schegloff, 2007)

Transcript Symbols (Schegloff, 2007)

(0.0)	Numbers in the parentheses indicate silence in tenths of a second
(.)	A dot in the parentheses indicate a micropause, usually less than 0.2 second
[ ]	Brackets indicate the beginning and the end of the overlap
=	Equals signs come in pairs – one at the end of the line and the other at the start of another line, indicating: 1. if the two lines connected by the equals signs are by the same speaker, there was no break in between the two lines other than an overlap breaking the lines 2. if the two lines connected by the equal signs are by different speakers, the second line followed the first without discernible pause
.	A falling, final intonation contour
?	A rising intonation
,	A continuing intonation
::	A stretch of the sound
word	A stress or emphasis
WOrd	The upper case indicates a particularly loud talk
°	A relatively soft sound
°word°	The word in between the degree signs are markedly soft
-	A cut-off or self-interruption
_:	A falling intonation contour
:	A rising intonation contour or an inflection
↑	A sharp intonation rise
↓	A sharp intonation fall
> <	The talk between the signs is compressed or rushed
< >	The talk between the signs is markedly slow
hhh	Hearable aspirations representing laughter, breathing, and so on
(hhh)	An aspiration within the parentheses indicate the emergence of an aspiration in between the boundary of a word
.hhh	An inhalation
(( ))	Double parentheses indicate mark transcriber's descriptions of events
(word)	An uncertain transcription, representing a possibility
LH	Left hand
RH	Right hand
HS	Head shake
HSs	More than one head shakes

Appendix B: Classification of Refusal Formulas (originally developed by Beebe et al. (1990) and modified by Kwon (2004))

Classification of Refusal Formulas

A. Direct	
a. Performative	"I refuse"
b. Non-performative statement	
a) "No"	
b) Negative willingness/ability	"I can't," "I don't think so"
c) Passive negative willingness	"It will be difficult"
B. Indirect	
a. Statement of regret	"I'm sorry," "I feel terrible"
b. Wish	"I wish I could help you…"
c. Excuse, reason, explanation	
d. Statement of alternative	
e. Condition for future or past acceptance	"If you had asked me earlier, …"
f. Promise	I promise I will …"
g. Statement of principle or philosophy	
h. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor	threat, guilt trip, criticism, let interlocutor off the hook, self defense
i. Acceptance which functions as a refusal	unspecific or indefinite reply, lack of enthusiasm
j. Avoidance	non-verbal – silence, hesitation, do nothing; verbal – topic switch, joke, hedging
k. Statement solidarity	"As you and I have always known…"
l. Statement of relinquishment	"I can't do anything about it"
m. Asking a question	"Is it really effective?"
C. Adjuncts to refusals	
a. Statement of positive opinion	"I would love to …"
b. Statement of empathy	"I realize you are …" "I understand you are…"
c. Pause fillers	"uhh," "well," "uhm"
d. Gratitude, appreciation	
e. Elaboration on the reason	

국 문 초 록

구어 상황극과 구두 보고를 통한 한국인 영어 학습자의 요청에 대한 거절 및 인식

박 예 린

외국어교육과 영어전공

서울대학교 대학원

중간언어 화용론 (ILP) 연구는 학습자들의 화용론적 능력을 살펴보기 위해 학습자들이 다양한 언어 행위를 어떻게 인지하고 발화하는지에 관심을 가져왔다. 거절은 체면 위협 행위(face-threatening act)라는 특징을 지니기 때문에 비원어민 화자들이 수행하기 어려운 행위이다. 본 연구는 한국인 영어 학습자들이 대화 상대방의 요청에 대하여 거절하는 것을 심도 있게 분석했다. 열 여섯 명의 서로 다른 영어 수준의 학습자들이 상호작용 속에서 어떻게 자신의 발화를 구조화하는지 살펴보기 위해 서로 다른 지위의 두 명의 원어민 영어 화자들과 역할극에 참여했다. 수집된 자료는 대화 분석의 틀로 분석되었다. 이에 더해 본 연구는 학습자들의 인식을 살펴보기 위해 역할극 이후에 구두 보고(retrospective verbal report)을 실행했다. 연구 결과, 학습자들은 이유에 대한 설명과 더불어 대안 제시를 가장 많이 사용한 것으로 밝혀졌다. 대화 상대방의 지위에 따라 달리 나타난 특징은

학습자들이 지위에 대한 민감도를 지니고 있음을 보여주었다. 또한 학습자들의 수준에 따라 상대방에게 공감하는 능력, 언어적인 능력에 있어 상이한 양상을 보여주었다. 회상 면담은 학습자들의 자신의 발화에 대한 생각과 화용론적 능력에 대한 인식에 대한 정보를 제공해주었다. 대다수의 학습자들의 판단과 원어민의 평가는 일치하는 결과를 보였지만, 원어민 화자에게 부적절하게 받아들여진 학습자들의 발화도 존재하였다. 이는 학습자들 화용언언어적 지식이 부족했음을 보여준다. 이에 더해 회상 면담 내내 학습자들의 목표 언어 화용론적 지식에 대한 불확실함이 드러났다. 본 연구 결과는 학습자들에게 정확한 언어 형식에만 몰두하는 것이 성공적인 상호작용으로 이어지지 않음을 인지시킬 필요성을 보여준다. 또한 목표 언어 화용론적 지식, 특히 화용언어적 측면에 대한 학습을 통해 학습자들이 목표 언어 화용론적 능력을 향상시킬 수 있음을 시사한다.

주요어: 거절 행위, 언어 행위, 화용론적 능력, 의사소통 능력, 화용론적 지식, 중간언어 화용론

학 번: 2017-20124